



1947

# Imperialism in the Election of 1900 in the United States

Henry Borzo

*Loyola University Chicago*

## Recommended Citation

Borzo, Henry, "Imperialism in the Election of 1900 in the United States" (1947). *Master's Theses*. Paper 59.  
[http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/59](http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/59)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).  
Copyright © 1947 Henry Borzo

IMPERIALISM IN THE ELECTION OF 1900  
IN THE UNITED STATES

By  
Henry Borzo

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master Of Arts in  
Loyola University

June  
1947

## Vita

Henry Borzo was born in Calgary, Alberta, Canada, on the 6th of October, 1913.

He was graduated from the University of Washington, receiving his BA. degree in March of 1938.

From September of 1938 to June of 1941 he was engaged as Instructor in History at Seattle College, a Jesuit College accredited to the University of Washington, in Seattle, Washington.

Receiving a scholarship from Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois, graduate studies were begun there in September, 1941. These were interrupted upon being called to service in the Armed Forces.

After three years in the Pacific Theatre, graduate studies were resumed in February, 1946. The writer has been engaged since July, 1946 as Instructor in History at Loyola University.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Introduction: The Problem.....	1
II. Our Expanding United States.....	4
III. Economic Maturity.....	7
IV. We Fight a Little War, April-August, 1898.....	11
V. The Election of 1898.....	16
VI. Bryan and the Peace, February, 1899.....	20
VII. The Philippine-American War, February, 1899—1901..	26
VIII. Beveridge and Expansion, January, 1900.....	29
IX. Boers and Boxers.....	33
X. Conventions and Platforms, June—July, 1900.....	39
XI. Bryan and Roosevelt Speak, August, 1900.....	46
XII. McKinley's Acceptance, September, 1900.....	55
XIII. Pre-Election Summary.....	60
XIV. Election Results.....	67
XV. Conclusion.....	69
Bibliography.....	74
Appendices:	
I. The Democratic Platform.....	80
II. The Republican Platform.....	87
III. Bryan's Acceptance Speech (in part).....	93
IV. McKinley's Acceptance Letter (in part).....	108
V. Letter from F.R. Dulles, Ohio State University..	123

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM

It should not be without interest to inquire into the influence of the electorate on important issues in a democracy. If America grew to maturity nurtured on Washington's precept of minding its own business, a departure from this policy would command attention. One might reasonably expect that in a democracy important departures from traditional policy would be determined by, or at least sanctioned by, the electorate.

If avoiding foreign conquests had been our policy, there was then certainly a departure from that policy at the close of the last century when we acquired the Philippine Islands. Many of our most prominent statesmen refused to follow the McKinley administration in its acquisition of overseas possessions following the Spanish-American war. But the war was fought and the Islands were ours, by the 7th of February, 1899. This had all been accomplished between the national elections of 1896 and 1900---all in a period of less than a year.

The departure from traditional policy was brought before the electorate in the campaign of 1900. The Democratic Platform denounced the policy of the administration as Imperialistic and Militaristic. It stated that Imperialism was the

paramount issue. The Republicans scoffed at the thought. They referred to Expansion and went on to suggest that Prosperity was the issue.

It shall be our task to determine to what extent Imperialism was an issue in the election of 1900. If Imperialism was truly the paramount issue, we may conclude that our departure from old paths was at least posthumously sanctioned by the electorate; if it was not, we may be led to the conclusion that the electorate played little or no direct part in the new trend.

The journalism of the period of the campaign will to some extent reflect the sentiment of the nation; where it does not reflect such sentiment, it may be said certainly to have an influence on public opinion. Books and pamphlets of the period of the campaign will also have to be considered, as well as the official statements of the Democratic and Republican parties in their platforms and of their respective candidates.

But it is further felt that the probable feeling or attitude of the people in 1900 can be gauged with equal certainty by considering the events of the immediately preceding years. We must, in other words, look at the campaign and election of 1900 not only in the light of the newspaper comments on the eve of the election, but also in the light of the period, --- if we are to see it as it was seen in 1900. It is with this conviction in mind that some considerable space has been un-

hesitatingly devoted to what might be regarded as background material. If greater conviction results from a perusal of these antecedents of the autumn of 1900, combined with the periodical comments, as to the probable state of the public mind, this point will have been sustained.

## CHAPTER II

### OUR EXPANDING UNITED STATES

The American colonies were begun as commercial ventures,<sup>1</sup> and this circumstance of our birth was perhaps to influence us for many years. Though for a hundred and fifty years the "frontier of the British Empire" was somewhat remote from the world,<sup>2</sup> the next hundred and fifty saw the growth and expansion of that frontier to the status of a nation with its own frontiers. The area of the thirteen original states as constituted in 1790 was but 892,135 square miles.

Our Constitution was but fourteen years old when we acquired with the Louisiana purchase 827, 987 square miles. After the Mexican War of 1848 we added 1,276,997 square miles to our area. The purchase of Alaska in 1867 meant the addition of 586,400 square miles. We had thus in three-quarters of a century, quadrupled our territory. We might have been anti-imperialistic, but we were certainly an expansive and healthy young nation.

Our population followed apace. It had grown from 3,929,214 in 1790, to almost ten million in 1820 and to over

---

1 W. E. Woodward, A New American History, Garden City, New York, 1938.

2 F. L. Paxson, History of the American Frontier. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1924, 1.



sixty-two million in 1890. The census of 1900 gave our population as over 75,000,000. The center of population had shifted moreover from Baltimore, Maryland, in 1790 to Columbus, Indiana, a hundred years later. The electorate of 1900 could recall the practical doubling of the population of the country.

The electorate also remembered the Indian wars of the west. It had appreciated the fact that the frontier was no more. The historian Frederick Jackson Turner said that the frontier had disappeared by 1890, a full decade before the campaign on Imperialism or Expansion. Industry and commerce had grown enormously. Exports to foreign countries increased. New states had been admitted to the union. Railroads seemed to bind the nation into a more compact union. The opening of the new century was really a time for optimism. Predictions of the coming census were published.<sup>3</sup>

We were also becoming more urbanized. The urban population had increased 36.4% over the population of 1890 while the rural element had increased but 12.2%.<sup>4</sup> We were raising our educational standards. Now 50.5% of our population between the ages of 5 to 20, were in school. Over 65 million of our

---

<sup>3</sup> North American Review, July, 1900.

<sup>4</sup> 16th U.S. Census, I, (Population), Washington, 1942, 18.

75 million population were native born citizens.

Our life had been one of restlessness and expansion. Now that the frontier was no more, might we not look to expansion abroad? It was after all, an age of expansion. Great Britain was now pushing her way in Africa. France was contending with Britain at Fashoda. Russia was trying to get a better hold on China. "Belgium was beginning to exploit the Congo; Germany was picking up unconsidered trifles everywhere."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Sullivan, Mark, Our Times 1900-1925, Vol. V, Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937, p. 48.

### CHAPTER III

#### ECONOMIC MATURITY

By 1900 the hard times of the "rich man's panic" of 1893 had become but the memory of a bad dream. The fact that we had not only recovered, but had risen to new commercial and industrial heights caused us all the more to look upon the hard times as but a lull in the march of progress.

Though the majority of the people were still engaged in agricultural pursuits, the value of manufactures was practically three times that of farm products.<sup>1</sup> It was an era, furthermore, of great business consolidation. In 1890 there were 18 trusts listed with an aggregate capital of 288 million dollars while the decade following listed 157 trusts and a capital of 3,150 million dollars.<sup>2</sup> Financially, there were also many indices of increased activity. In 1896 our bank clearings were 51 billion dollars.<sup>3</sup> This figure rose to 80 billions in 1900. Our government's total receipts had risen from about 327 million dollars in 1896 to 566 million in 1900.<sup>4</sup>

We had nearly trebled the value of our manufacturing ex-

---

1 David S. Muzzey and J. A. Krout, American History for Colleges. Ginn and Co., Chicago, 1943, 598.

2 Ibid., 599.

3 The Economist, Chicago, October, 27, 1900.

4 The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, New York, July 7, 1900

port trade in the last years of the century. Our trade with Cuba had risen to over 100 million dollars in 1893.<sup>5</sup> The value of exports in 1890 was about 858 million dollars. A decade later it was 1,394 million dollars.<sup>6</sup> American manufacturers began to look for foreign markets as they became convinced of the necessity of economic imperialism. "It was Messrs. Rockefeller, Pierpont Morgan, and their associates," one authority tells us, "who needed imperialism and who fastened it upon the shoulders of the great Republic of the West. They felt they needed imperialism because they desired to use the public resources of their country to find profitable employment for their capital which otherwise would be superfluous."<sup>7</sup>

William McKinley had been elected in 1896 and no sooner had he taken the oath of office in March, 1897 than Congress was called in special session to frame a new tariff law. In spite of the allegations expressed in the inaugural address, the new tariff was concerned with protection, rather than revenue only.<sup>8</sup> The business interests were served by and worked in close harmony with, the president.

The great issue of the election of 1896 had been the

---

<sup>5</sup> Louis M. Hacker and B. B. Kendrick, The United States Since 1865. F. S. Crofts and Co., New York, 1939, 331.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas A. Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People F. S. Crofts and Co., New York, 1945, 459.

<sup>7</sup> J. A. Hobson, Imperialism, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1938.

<sup>8</sup> Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 324.

silver question. In addition to what appeared to be a popular mandate in favor of big business and gold, there were added to the Republican victory other factors. The discovery of gold in the Klondike helped to stimulate the production of gold in the world from between five and six million ounces, annually, from 1860 to 1890, to eleven and a half million ounces in 1897.<sup>9</sup> In March, 1900, the gold standard act was passed. Silver could no longer be a paramount issue.

Further world conditions affected us at the close of the century. The European wheat crop fell short in 1896 by some 30%.<sup>10</sup> There was famine in India. Our harvest of 1897 was the second largest in our history, and we exported in twelve months, 150 million bushels of wheat and flour. We sent 5,000 tons of corn to India. During this same period 120 millions in gold bullion came back to our country. The frequent threats to the treasury by the draining of this precious metal to Europe, were to be no more. The situation made possible the success of the Gold Standard Act.<sup>11</sup> But it had even further repercussions.

This year, 1897, was the first year in our history in

---

9 Ida M. Tarbell, The Nationalization of Business. Macmillan Co., New York, 1936, 258.

10 Alexander Dana Noyes, Forty Years Of American Finance. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1909, 270.

11 Ibid., 272.

which we began to loan money to Europe.<sup>12</sup> We had always been the borrowers, and now became the lenders. Our status had truly changed and a new era had opened.

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 281.

CHAPTER IV  
WE FIGHT A LITTLE WAR,  
APRIL-AUGUST, 1898

America had had her eye on Cuba ever since the days of Jefferson. Our Monroe Doctrine of 1823 tacitly approved of Spanish sovereignty there. In the fifties President Buchanan and the State Department considered purchasing the island but nothing came of it. Our economic interests in the island grew in the seventies, eighties and nineties, but the American business man was apparently more interested in the political stability of the island than in the question of sovereignty.<sup>1</sup>

That stability, however, was seriously disrupted by the insurrection which broke out in 1895. General Weyler was sent by the Spanish Government to suppress the rebellion. His reconcentration policy was reported in this country in the most unfavorable light possible. Insurrectionists secretly received aid from America and were very active in enlisting the sympathies of American newspapers and organizations. William Randolph Hearst in his New York Journal was having a circulation battle with Joseph Pulitzer and the latter's World. As each tried to outdo the other in sensationalism, they were copied by other papers in the country. The American public be-

---

<sup>1</sup> Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 328.

<sup>2</sup> Bailey, op. cit., 499.

gan to feel indignation that such outrages should be committed at her front door. While President Cleveland set himself against the popular clamor, Congress passed a resolution favoring recognition of the belligerency of the Cuban insurrectos. In the fall of the election year of 1896, popular attention was drawn largely to the campaign and the issue of 16-1. The Republican platform, however, did recommend that the United States Government exert influence in favor of Cuban independence. Not to be outdone, the Democrats also expressed sympathy with the rebels.<sup>3</sup>

In 1897 President McKinley appointed Theodore Roosevelt Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Mr. Roosevelt, who felt that war with Spain was imminent, did all in his power to prepare us for it. Spain recalled General Weyler and had more moderate policies enforced. The American minister at Madrid was assured that autonomy would be granted as soon as the insurrection was in hand.<sup>4</sup>

But our sympathies had been aroused and our property, fifty million dollars worth, was threatened, as were American lives, by the instability. The party for war in this country, which included such men as men as Roosevelt, John Hay, Henry Cabot Lodge, Whitelaw Reid, Captain Mahan, Jack London and

---

3 Muzzey and Krout, op. cit., 584 (fn).

4 Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 334.



Buffalo Bill,<sup>5</sup> continued to speak of its necessity.<sup>6</sup> The Hearst Press found further ammunition in an indiscreet but private letter by the Spanish Minister at Washington. This letter, referring to our President as a "common politician" was printed in papers all over the country and further inflamed the public against Spain.<sup>7</sup> The battleship Maine was sent to Havana late in January of 1898 to safeguard American interests. On the 15th of February the Maine was mysteriously blown up. On the 9th of March our Congress appropriated fifty million dollars for national defense---an amount identical with that taken in by the Treasury annually in sugar duties in the eighties.<sup>8</sup>

Roosevelt had already cabled Dewey in Hongkong on the 25th of February to coal up in case of war with Spain. The sinking of the Maine made popular the cry: "Remember the Maine! To hell with Spain!"<sup>9</sup> In spite of the fact that Spain was willing to grant all of our demands except that of granting an armistice, unless the insurgents should ask for it, McKinley had given in to the war party.<sup>10</sup> War was declared on the 25th

---

5 Gregory Mason, Remember the Maine. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1939, 40.

6 Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 329.

7 Walter Millis, The Martial Spirit. The Literary Guild of America, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, 98.

8 Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 328.

9 Gregory Mason, op. cit., 18.

10 Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 338.

of April. The enlisted men of the navy, "who often grew bored to the point of desertion in peace, became keyed up to a high pitch of efficiency."<sup>11</sup>

We had entered upon a "most unmistakable campaign of aggression,"<sup>12</sup> and all in the spirit of "schoolboys off for a picnic."<sup>13</sup> But we were hardly admitting this. It was rather, we preferred to say, a war for suffering humanity. We agreed with the President who had said in December, 1897, that "forcible....can not be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression."<sup>14</sup> Yet, we were going to war against a nation which, according to our greatest war enthusiast, "never dreamed" of making offensive war, and "which, if made, it would have been wholly unable to execute."<sup>15</sup>

The war did not last long. A succession of victories put America in high spirits. The Spanish navy was defeated near Santiago, Cuba, and, in the Philippines, in the harbor of Manila; Roosevelt, Lieutenant-Colonel in the Rough Riders,<sup>16</sup> attained fame in the assault on San Juan Hill. Admiral Dewey was awaiting men to take the city of Manila. "The country was

---

11 Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1929, 212.

12 Gregory Mason, op. cit., 129.

13 A. M. Schlesinger, The Rise of the City. Macmillan Co., New York, 1933, 430.

14 J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents. Washington, 1899, X, 131.

15 Roosevelt, op. cit., 215.

16 The Rough Riders were commanded by Colonel Leonard Wood at the request of Roosevelt who had been offered the command.

excited. Emporia was thrilled to the core."<sup>17</sup> We had arrived. We too, had "colonies" and "natives". Magazines illustrating the romantic tropical palms and other far-way places were popular.<sup>18</sup> Dewey probably came away with the larger share of glory. People smoked Dewey cigars, wore Dewey hats, drank Dewey whiskey, and gave Dewey a house in Washington. We even considered him for the presidency—at least until we found out he could not decide to which party he belonged. Patriotic sentiments were stirred in us as the news of these victories had come to us and as the boys were returned to us. John Hay dubbed it a "splendid little war".

Battle casualties totaled only 1,983, though at least double that number suffered from malaria as a result of the war. Inefficiency in the War Department was roundly criticized. But these factors seemed to be but a small price to pay for our victory. Patriotic feelings were but little affected by scandals in the War Department.<sup>19</sup> The war was over by the 12th of August, so, in less than four months we had covered ourselves with glory and had attained a new and stronger position in the "family" of nations.

---

17 W. A. White, Autobiography of William Allen White. Macmillan, New York, 1946, 320.

18 Walter Millis, op. cit., 361.

19 Merle Curti, The Roots of American Loyalty. Columbia University Press, 1946, 195.

## CHAPTER V

### THE ELECTION OF 1898

During the war we annexed the Hawaiian Islands. The resolution was passed on the 6th of July, and since Dewey had taken the harbor of Manila, military expediency could be brought forward as a sufficient cause to bring about a termination to this dispute of long standing. Speaker Reed later said that it was no more necessary to annex Hawaii in order to conquer Spain than it was to annex the moon.<sup>1</sup> But he was not looking ahead.

The commission to negotiate peace was appointed on the 26th of August. Though Democrats might, now that the war was over, be tending toward anti-imperialism, there were as yet no clear cut party lines on this question.<sup>2</sup> President McKinley seemed to be uncertain as to what to do with the Philippines, —though we did not yet, as a matter of fact, possess them. England, who had been favorable to us, alone of the European powers, was urging us to take them. We didn't want to pull up stakes, and yet hesitated to go ahead. On the 16th of September a letter to the commissioners in Paris instructed them to demand all of the island of Luzon.<sup>3</sup> The fact that the insur-

---

1 Ellis P. Oberholtzer, A History of the US Since the Civil War. Macmillan Co., New York, 1937, V, 547.

2 Walter Millis, op. cit., 371.

3 Ibid., 373.

gents under General Aguinaldo had opened the first Congress of the Philippine Republic on the 15th of September was ignored by us.

On the 10th of October McKinley spoke to an audience in the Middle West, using such terms as Dewey, Duty and Destiny.<sup>4</sup> The applause from the crowd apparently indicated that at least the Middle West was in favor of Expansion, and seemed to help the President make up his mind. On the 25th of October the Commissioners were informed that all of the Philippines must be demanded. The Commissioners found this not hard to do. All of them favored annexation except Senator Gray, and had perhaps been selected on that basis. If we give McKinley credit for being politically astute and determining correctly that the majority of the voters favored territorial expansion,<sup>5</sup> he should perhaps have even more credit for looking into the future and selecting Commissioners in favor of annexation.

The Democratic Campaign Book, published in 1898, expressed sympathy for the people of Cuba in their struggle for liberty and claimed that the Republican leaders in Congress were Spanish sympathizers.<sup>6</sup> This obviously bears out the

---

4 Bailey, op. cit., 519.

5 H. W. Faulkner, The Quest for Social Justice. Macmillan Co., New York, 1931, 308.

6 Democratic Campaign Book, Democratic Congressional Committee, T. W. Cadick, Printer, Washington, 1898, 198.

statement above that by the fall of 1898 there was not as yet a strong Democratic plea against Imperialism. On the contrary, the book contends that the Democrats wanted intervention and that the Republicans obstructed it as late as the first of July, 1897.<sup>7</sup> This is accusing the Republicans of slack patriotism and not of imperialism. A few of the Democratic state conventions decried territorial expansion while the Republicans were speaking for the retention of the islands already acquired.<sup>8</sup> But larger than both of these ripples were the acclamations of approval of the war for humanity and of the efforts of our fighting men.<sup>9</sup> Both parties expressed a desire for the termination of the struggle.

Roosevelt, hero of the war, was elected Governor of New York. The new Congress was to remain Republican, and opened with 163 Democrats, 185 Republicans, 7 Populists and 2 Silver Party members in the House. The Senate was to have 55 Republicans, 26 Democrats, 4 Populists and also 2 Silver Party men.<sup>10</sup> The speaker of the House, "Czar" Reed, resigned in disagreement with the policies of the administration. Genuine as his disagreement was, we should remember that the House had a clear Republican majority and that pressure was probably put

---

7 Ibid., 199.

8 The World Almanac, 1899, Press Publishing Co., New York, 119-21.

9 World Almanac, cit., 120.

10 Ibid.

on Reed by McKinley and Hanna.<sup>11</sup>

In his second Annual Message to Congress on December 5th, 1898, McKinley reviewed the events of the year. He spoke of assisting the Cubans to "form a government which shall be free and independent", and that "Spanish rule must be replaced by a just, benevolent, and humane government, created by the people of Cuba", but made no mention of the Philippine Islands.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> W. A. White, op. cit., 336.

<sup>12</sup> Richardson, op. cit., 176.

## CHAPTER VI

### Bryan and the Peace, February, 1899

We had actually captured the city of Manila a few hours after the signing of the document that presumably ended hostilities. The peace Commissioners in Paris had to contend with this fact and our government was anxious to terminate the war. We finally offered to pay 20 million dollars to Spain for the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Guam. The Treaty of Paris was signed December 10th, 1898.

Though the election had failed to express strong anti-imperialist sentiments, opposition to our course now began in earnest. Even before the treaty was signed George S. Boutwell, former governor of Massachusetts, was elected president of the Anti-Imperialist League. This organization numbered among its members "men of high discrimination" who profoundly regretted the steps which were being taken by our government.<sup>1</sup> Among the "old fashioned Americans,"<sup>2</sup> there were ex-presidents Cleveland and Harrison, ex-speaker Reed, Andrew Carnegie, Carl Schurz, Senator George Hoar of Massachusetts, Charles Francis Adams, Samuel Gompers, ex-secretary of State Sherman, who had

---

1 Oberholtzer, op. cit., 588.

2 Charles and Mary Beard, Rise of American Civilization. Macmillan Co., New York, 1927, II.



resigned in April,<sup>3</sup> David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford, ex-postmaster General, William L. Wilson, Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, Mark Twain, and many other prominent men. They said imperialism was against the letter and spirit of the very foundations of our country. It was their opinion that Aguinaldo was fighting for his rights and that the administration had no right to pass on the capacities of the Filipinos to rule themselves.<sup>4</sup>

Debate began in the Senate on the treaty. Our position under the Monroe Doctrine would be threatened if we took the Islands, some said. The Democrats said that we went to war to free the Cubans and not to annex Filipinos. The expansionists said that it was our manifest destiny that compelled us to take over this new responsibility. Where once the flag had been placed it could not be taken down. We were not to shun the "White Man's Burden." Two days before the final vote was to be taken, on the 4th of February, insurrection broke out in the Philippines. Debate had been vigorous and it was evident that the treaty needed more votes for ratification. It was at this crucial time that William Jennings Bryan ar-

---

3 "I am and always have been opposed to war in the Philippines" said Sherman. George H. Shibley, "Momentous Issues". Bureau of Economic Research of New York City, Schulte Publishing Co., Chicago, September, 1900, 207.

4 George S. Boutwell, The Crisis of the Republic. Dana Estes and Co., Boston, 1900, 160.

rived in Washington.<sup>5</sup>

Bryan had been defeated on the issue of 16-1 in 1896 but received in that election 51% of the total popular vote and still had a large following. He had spoken in favor of Cuban independence which "he knew meant war,"<sup>6</sup> and in that way lent his influence somewhat to the forces which were rapidly stampeding McKinley and the government into a reluctant war."<sup>7</sup> He raised the Third Nebraska Regiment, was its Colonel in command and served in Florida from July 13, 1898, to December 12, 1898. This prevented him from participating in the elections of 1898, but he was soon preparing for the campaign of 1900.

Bryan urged his Democratic friends to vote for ratification of the treaty annexing the Philippine Islands. On the 6th of February, 84 Senators voted on the treaty. There were 57 yeas, one more than required. Of the yeas there were 39 Republicans, 10 Democrats, 8 Populists and Silver Independents, who voted.<sup>8</sup> Bryan had saved the day for the annexationists.<sup>9</sup>

Bryan stated that he urged ratification because he wanted to see the war ended. After the ratification of the treaty

5 Bailey, op. cit., 523.

6 "His mind was like a soup dish, wide and shallow," said Irving Stone of Bryan in his They Also Ran. Doubleday Doran Co., New York, 1943, 59.

7 M. R. Werner, Bryan, Harcourt Brace and Co., New York, 1929, 120.

8 Oberholtzer, op. cit., 593.

9 Ibid., 592.

there was a Bacon resolution proposed to promise independence to the Philippines. This resolution failed to pass by one vote, but Bryan in explaining why he urged ratification, states: "I favored a resolution promising independence".<sup>10</sup> This comes as an anti-climax to his actions for the treaty to take the Philippines for twenty million dollars.

There is also the point of view that Bryan urged ratification so that the Democrats would have an issue to fight over in the coming election.<sup>11</sup> This view is stressed by many, and not without reason, for a week after the ratification Bryan began to denounce Imperialism.<sup>12</sup> William Allen White, editor at Emporia, who had favored the war, met Bryan for the first time in 1900. "Bryan, even in that day, was too much of a professional politician to suit my tastes," he writes.<sup>13</sup> It is likely that Bryan was more of an orator and politician than a scholar of national or international questions.<sup>14</sup>

But Bryan was not alone. Another critic of the McKinley administration felt that there was nothing to do but ratify the treaty.<sup>15</sup> Rejecting it would, it was stated, "unsettle

---

10 Shibley, op. cit., 136.

11 Werner, op. cit., 120.

12 Ibid., 121.

13 W. A. White, op. cit., 328.

14 Most of the books in his library were written not by scholars but by partisans of his creed, according to reference in 13 above. Irving Stone, in work cited, states that Bryan was at heart a Baptist minister and a fuzzy minded humanist who stopped thinking when he discovered his power of oratory.

15 William McKinley and the G.O.P. under the X-Ray. by a Free Lance in Politics. Morely & Briggs, Cleveland, 1900.

the delicate negotiations with Spain,"<sup>16</sup> even though, "Spain could only submit like the small boy with the big bully, to whatever peace conditions were offered he...."<sup>17</sup> Another contemporary tells us that rejecting the treaty would have "resulted in repudiating the President, unsettling business, and adding to the international uncertainties."<sup>18</sup>

If the above argument was valid, one wonders why all the Senators were not able to see it and vote for unanimous approval. But still, if rejecting the treaty would have made a bad situation, then we should perhaps not be too harsh with Mr. Bryan. He would then have been doing a service to his government, and the fact that he thought an issue of imperialism would result, could be regarded as merely a fortuitous by-product. Bryan's opponents however, and the public at large, could hardly help sensing an inconsistency in Mr. Bryan's character. Delicate international situation or not, the public could not help but wonder just how anti-imperialistic he was.

One can hardly help but think that a man as intently anti-imperialistic as he claimed to be, could do nothing but reject the treaty. Bryan went out of his way, to influence the vo-

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 240. An effort was made to discover the authorship of this work but the publishers are no longer in business.

<sup>18</sup> Bailey, op. cit., 524.

ting. Even if it were true that the acceptance of the treaty were good, why, of all people to cause its acceptance, should the man who was to represent the anti-imperialists, come forward? One cannot help but sense a politician about.

CHAPTER VII  
PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN WAR,  
FEBRUARY, 1899—1901

The Filipinos had been fighting to free themselves from Spain before we were at war with that power. When war broke out in April, 1898, the Filipinos felt that their chances of independence had increased.

Before Dewey sailed for Manila from Hongkong he contacted Aguinaldo, the leader of the insurrectionists. Aguinaldo was later brought back to the Philippines by an American vessel. The Filipinos received the impression that we had come to help them.<sup>1</sup> Individual American leaders gave the Filipinos this idea while seeking their aid, though our government made no official commitments of alliance with them.

The war was over by the middle of August but no steps were being taken by the Americans to quit the Islands. By December the Peace Treaty was signed and it had become clear that the Filipinos had been merely given a change of masters.

---

<sup>1</sup> James R. Williams, (Representative for Illinois) testimony in the House of Representatives. Congressional Record, 56th Congress, 1st session, Vol. 33, 5-7 June, 1900. Most historians seem to concur in this view.

Two days before the final vote on the treaty in our Senate, the Philippine-American War broke out. Some Filipinos had been ordered to halt, failed to do so, and were fired upon. Soon Americans had been fired upon, as well as our flag. Our national honor was now at stake, some said.<sup>2</sup> This was referred to in the press as an "insurrection". An attack upon our flag was never to be tolerated. There was now no alternative now but to stay and bring order out of this chaos. The New York Times decided that the outbreak proved the Filipinos to be incapable of self-rule.<sup>3</sup> The insurrection seemed to justify voting down the Bacon Resolution which proposed that we stay only long enough to restore order.<sup>4</sup>

Seventy thousand men were sent to the Islands to meet there with mud, malaria and guerrilla tactics. Many found out in time that they cared more the Spaniards whom they had fought, and who had held some positions for us until we could take over (against the insurrectionists), than for the little "brown brother" Filipinos.<sup>5</sup> News of the progress of the war was very meager. Some said that strict censorship was maintained in order that no information should get to the Filipinos and aid their cause; others contended that censorship was

---

2 Charles A. Beard, Contemporary American History. Macmillan Co., New York, 1923, 26.

3 Oberholtzer, op. cit., 594.

4 Bailey, op. cit., 524.

5 Gregory Mason, op. cit., 118 ff.

needlessly strict and that the daily promises of victory were but efforts to disguise our failures.<sup>6</sup> In spite of the reports and promises of success, the war was still on at the time of the election in November and was not to be terminated until May, 1901.

The Philippine Commission had reported that only a small part of the Filipinos desired independence. Yet fighting continued in most of Luzon and many other places.<sup>7</sup> As the political campaign progressed in our country, it was reported that the Philippines were never united and that they were fighting against the friars and not for political freedom.<sup>8</sup>

---

6 Literary Digest, July 1, 1899, quoting from "The Philadelphia Ledger".

7 Ibid., June 2, 1900.

8 North American Review, September, 1900.



## CHAPTER VIII

### BEVERIDGE AND EXPANSION, JANUARY 1900

If anyone personified the expansionists spirit it was the new Senator from Indiana--Albert Beveridge. He had spoken before the Middlesex Club in Boston and was loudly cheered when he said that Grant "never forgot that we are a conquering race, and that we must obey our blood and occupy new markets, and if necessary, new lands."<sup>1</sup> He said we were producing more than we could use; the trade of the world would be ours; American civilization and its flag were to be planted on shores "to be made beautiful and bright".

But the ovation he here received was slight as compared with the breakers of applause that were to come after his speech in the Senate in January, 1900. He had visited the Philippines in the summer of 1899, endangering his life to get information, and had reported to President McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt in August and September, 1899.

His maiden speech in the Senate informed us the "Almighty God has marked us as his chosen people henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world".<sup>2</sup> He continued in this

---

1 Claude G. Bowers, Beveridge and the Progressive Era.  
Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1932, 67.

2 Ibid., 119.

vein to say that, "God has not been preparing the English speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing---He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns....He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savages and servile peoples."<sup>3</sup> "As he resumed his seat, the galleries roared their applause. From coast to coast this was for several days a front page story. We had apparently become not unwilling to take up Kipling's "White Man's Burden". It was all in the spirit of the times."<sup>4</sup>

Perhaps this new expansionist feeling was more than high sounding patriotic noises. The crusading spirit was "subordinate to the driving force of the economic factor. The dramatic character of the change is due to the unprecedented rapidity of the industrial revolution...."<sup>5</sup> Foreign markets were sought for manufactures as well as for investments. It was this which was "avowedly responsible for the adoption of Imperialism as a political policy and practice by the Republican Party...."<sup>6</sup> The great industrial and financial chiefs belonged to the Republican Party and the party belonged to

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 121.

<sup>4</sup> Sullivan, op.cit., 48.

<sup>5</sup> Hobson, op.cit., 73.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 77.

them.<sup>7</sup> Some critics of government policy have overlooked the fact that the greatest taxpayers are inevitably, if not justifiably, going to have more to say about government policy than the non-tax or small tax payers.

Beveridge and the expansionists may have been stimulated by the imperialistic spirit of other nations. About a week before the speech by Beveridge, the German Kaiser had announced his new greater navy program. "The mysticism of Empire building"<sup>8</sup> fascinated us. We had read The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, by Captain Mahan. This work was published in 1892 and had captivated the mind of Theodore Roosevelt. Mahan fought disarmament and compulsory arbitration and helped to influence the Congress to annex Hawaii.<sup>9</sup> Henry Cabot Lodge and Roosevelt "deferred continually to Mahan's views,"<sup>10</sup> and supported his plans for the founding of a naval college.<sup>11</sup>

The expansionists numbered among them also practical politicians who were subjected to certain pressures from the electorate. Not only were sugar interests active in problems

---

7 Hobson, in the work referred to above, makes a point of the fallaciousness of the argument for the "necessity" of markets. This is however, beside the point for our purposes. It was what the industrial leaders believed to be to their interests, which determined policy, regardless of the accuracy or inaccuracy of their basic assumptions.

8 Harvey Wish, Contemporary America. Harper Brothers, New York, 1935, 101.

9 Ibid., 104.

10 Ibid., 105.

11 Matthew Josephson, The President Makers. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1923, 71.

relative to Cuba and Hawaii, but union interests were also alert. The union cigar rollers, 250,000 of them, had informed Hanna that if Puerto Rican cigars were let in duty free, that each of them would get three other men to vote against the Republicans, making a total of one million votes.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> H. H. Kohlsaat, From McKinley to Harding. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1923, 21.

## CHAPTER IX

### BOERS AND BOXERS

While we were occupied in supressing the Philippine "insurrection" the British were embroiled in a war with the Boers in South Africa. This too, was proving to be a greater assignment than had at first been expected. This war had commenced in the autumn of 1899, and, though some success had been achieved for the British by the summer of 1900, broke out with renewed vigor in the autumn of 1900. Though the conservatives retained power in England as a result of the "Khaki Election", the war in South Africa indicated the amount of "dislike felt for her on the Continent."<sup>1</sup>

American public opinion also favored the Boers,<sup>2</sup> since we usually espoused the cause of the underdog in a fight. There seemed even an analogy in the Boers fighting against Britain and our fight against Britain for Independence in 1776. Oswald Garrison Villard's Evening Post championed the cause of the Boers as did many other papers.<sup>3</sup> But even if we were

---

<sup>1</sup> H. L. Featherstone, A Century of Nationalism. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., London, 1939, 141.

<sup>2</sup> Sullivan, op. cit., 11

<sup>3</sup> Oswald Garrison Villard, Fighting Years, Memoirs of a Liberal Editor. Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1939, 138.

somewhat revolted by the imperialistic gestures of Britain, it is doubtful that we would consider her situation at all the same as that of ours in the Philippines. The Filipinos after all were rebels who had fired upon our flag.

Our government also committed itself to strict neutrality. England had at least given us moral support in the Spanish-American war, when the rest of Europe was not too favorably disposed. Boer representatives on the 21st of May were cordially received by our President.<sup>4</sup> They were shown the gardens back of the White House when they brought up the question of aid from the United States. The press of the country seemed to approve of the President's conduct.<sup>5</sup> By the summer of 1900, as mentioned above, it was thought the Boers had been crushed and that the war to all intents and purposes was over.<sup>6</sup> A practical political aspect was suggested in that administration approval of British activities would cause the loss of German Republican votes in this country.<sup>7</sup> In other words, even though photographs of and stories about the Boers appeared "almost daily in the American newspapers,"<sup>8</sup> the political repercussions or effect on government neutrality was slight.

---

4 Sullivan, op. cit., 523.

5 Literary Digest, June 2, 1900.

6 Ibid., June 9, 1900.

7 The Forum, XXIX, May, 1900, 316.

8 Sullivan, op. cit., 11.

The Boers were fighting for a just cause<sup>9</sup> and the British voter had been duped in the Khaki election of 1900,<sup>10</sup> but the American people still supported our successes for our situation had been different. But probably having a more direct bearing upon our foreign policy and our attitude toward Imperialism were the events in China in the summer of 1900.

China had been defeated by Japan in 1895. Thereafter, Europe, even more furiously than before, descended upon China to gain concessions. Though our trade with China was but two per cent of our total foreign trade, we felt this trade to be important.<sup>11</sup> We had previously, because of our policy of isolation, been content to let Britain and France do the fighting in China.

The summer of 1900 saw the outbreak of the Boxer Rebellion—an "anti-foreign movement" which had "taken on the proportions of a vast national uprising."<sup>12</sup> All foreign legations were endangered. Our minister, E.H. Conger, wrote to Hay on June 11. "We are besieged in Peking, entirely cut off from outside communication."<sup>13</sup> This condition continued for more than two months. America and Europe were horrified to contemplate the possible massacre of their nationals. As pointed

---

9 The North American Review, July, 1900, 12.

10 Review of Reviews, London, XXII, November, 1900, 424.

11 J. F. Rhodes, The McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations. Macmillan, New York, 1923, 125.

12 Literary Digest, July 21, 1900.

13 Rhodes, op. cit., 128.

out above, the prime interest, as reflected in the newspapers and periodicals, was China. Pictures of persons in China were reproduced in the magazines. Our government sent 2400 troops to China to participate with troops of other European powers and Japanese, in suppressing the revolts. The legations were finally relieved by August 14th.

But even after that date, the interest in things Chinese ---Chinese politics, economics, art, literature and religion, continued almost unabated.

We had necessarily joined the other powers in this "call of humanity", stated our magazine.<sup>14</sup> The President's policy was generally supported.<sup>15</sup> Even if we opposed the President on the Philippine question we should support him now.<sup>16</sup> National questions were overshadowed.<sup>17</sup> The Philadelphia Times did not reflect the feelings of the country as a whole when it said that the action of the President was the worst sort of imperialism.<sup>18</sup>

Regardless of this question, as our knowledge of China increased, we became convinced that we had gone too far now to draw back.<sup>19</sup> The Philippine question was but a local one, compared to the question of participation in Chinese affairs in

---

14 Atlantic Monthly, August, 1900, 276,

15 The Nation, July 5, 1900, 7.

16 North American Review, August, 1900, 153.

17 Ibid., 145.

18 Literaty Digest, July 7, 1900.

19 North American Review, August, 1900, 172.



relation to the Monroe Doctrine.<sup>20</sup> But China desired us to take a hand and she in return could give us new markets, said the Chinese Minister to the United States.<sup>21</sup> Should we retire completely, the European powers might establish preferential tariffs in their spheres of interests and our commerce would suffer.<sup>22</sup>

On September 1st, 1899, John Hay had agreed with England on an "open door" policy. On March 20, 1900, this matter was followed up by notes to the major powers informing them that we considered their assent to the maintenance of the "open door" as final and definitive.<sup>23</sup> So far this policy only meant that there should be equal trade opportunities within the spheres of influence. On July 3, 1900, we went further and spoke of the territorial integrity of China. Europe was busy with other problems and had to pay heed to our words.

We had become a power in the Asiatic theatre. American diplomacy had triumphed, wrote the New York Tribune.<sup>24</sup> Hay was praised for his work.<sup>25</sup> Democratic charges of Imperialism were countered with Republican praise for John Hay, our

---

20. Ibid., 172.

21 North American Review, July, 1900, 5-7.

22 Rhodes, op. cit., 125.

23 Ibid., 125.

24 Oberholtzer, op. cit., 619.

25 H. Adams, The Education of Henry Adams. Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1918, 363.

"successful" secretary.<sup>26</sup>

We were become a new moral force in an old diplomacy.<sup>27</sup>  
To protect our new position we should have to keep the Philippines for a while..

"...the children of this world are wiser  
in their generation than the children  
of light."

Luke: XVI, 8.

---

26 Wish, op. cit., 121.

27 Bailey, op. cit., 531.

CHAPTER X  
CONVENTIONS AND PLATFORM,  
JUNE--JULY, 1900

The Republican convention met in Philadelphia in June, 1900. McKinley was re-nominated, as everyone had expected. The candidature of Vice-Presidency was somewhat uncertain. Mark Hanna the Republican manager favored Cornelius N. Bliss of New York; New York's boss Platt favored Theodore, the war hero—to get him out of New York politics.<sup>1</sup> Being a war hero and a good campaigner, he would strengthen the Republican ticket. Though he said he didn't want to run he appeared at the convention, sombrero and all, and was enthusiastically swept in.

The Republicans looked back upon an "unsurpassed record of achievement" according to the opening sentence of the platform. They said that when they took over from the Democrats that "business was dead, industry paralyzed and the National credit impaired...labor distressed and unemployed." From these very bad conditions to the good times that were now being enjoyed by all, was the transition credited to the legislation of the Republicans—protective tariff and gold stan-

---

1 Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 355.

2 See Appendix 2 for references to Republican Platform.

dard, especially. Excess of exports over imports, restored national credit, full employment and great prosperity are all cited as evidence of the success of Republican policies. The successful conclusion of a "war for liberty and human rights" in which "No thought of National aggrandizement tarnished the high purpose with which American standards" were maintained, was also ascribed to the Republican party. "A new and noble responsibility" had been acquired, the Republicans declared. Restriction of immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands is advocated, thus providing protection for the working man's full dinner pail.

The nation owes gratitude to its fighting men and should provide for the families of those killed or wounded, the platform stated. The acquisition of Hawaii is approved of; the settlement of the Samoan tangle is credited to McKinley; the Monroe Doctrine is reaffirmed. The Republicans affirmed that they had undoubtedly won the approval of the American people in accepting the Treaty of Paris and thus the "just responsibilities of our victories in the Spanish war". No other alternative course could have been taken. It was our duty to "put down armed insurrection and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples". Apparently we were determined to give them the blessings of civilization whether or not they wanted them or protested.

No mention of course is made of the progress of the war with the Filipinos or that it might be a protracted and costly venture. Nor was the cost of the war spoken of. But then, as long as we had had the emotional thrill of fighting a successful and "splendid little war" and were currently enjoying prosperity that was greater than any before, who would want to quibble over the cost. Since we had prosperity, who would doubt that it was due to the Republicans and their policy of protective tariff, protective immigration, and the gold standard. Why doubt these things and upset the apple cart. As long as our gasoline buggy would run, no need to lift up the hood for repairs.

The Democrats met in Kansas City, July 5, 1900. Everyone knew Bryan would be nominated again. There seemed to be no one else. Had the party felt strong chances of success the opponents of Bryan might have presented another candidate. Bryan was to be the only man to receive his party's nomination for the presidency three times in spite of failing to be elected.<sup>3</sup> Adalai Stevenson, vice-president under Cleveland, was chosen to run with Bryan.

The major difficulty in the convention arose over the old 16-1 issue. The party bosses wanted to exclude the silver issue, recognizing that it had lost its appeal to the elec-

---

<sup>3</sup> Sullivan, op. cit., 99.

torate,<sup>4</sup> but Bryan, showing "greater consistency than wisdom,"<sup>5</sup> insisted on the inclusion of the silver issue. It was included in the platform but with only one vote to spare.<sup>6</sup> Bryan didn't help his cause in carrying through his pet policy. The announcement that the Democratic platform was to contain the 16-1 issue resulted in a buying rally on the market "based on the belief that the defeat of the Democratic candidate was certain."<sup>7</sup>

The preamble of the platform reaffirmed "our faith in that immortal proclamation of the inalienable rights of man," as well as allegiance to the Constitution.<sup>8</sup> The platform goes on to say that all governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed and that the Constitution follows the flag. Imperialism abroad, or a country half Republic and half Empire, would, it declared, soon lead to despotism at home. The Porto-Rican law is denounced as being the first of imperialistic acts on the part of the Republican party. Freedom for the Cubans is also demanded. The Philippines policy is denounced, and the war with the Philippines is regarded as "unnecessary." The Filipinos are referred to as our "former allies". First a stable government should be established, then

---

4 F. L. Paxson, Recent History of the United States. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1929, 302.

5 Rhodes, op. cit., 126.

6 Oberholtzer, op. cit., 636.

7 The Economist, Chicago, July 7, 1900, 8.

8 For references to the Democratic Platform see Appendix 1.

we should give them independence and thirdly protect them as we had protected the South and Central American Republics. The cost of the war is also stated to be more than the returns could ever hope to be. They summarized with the statement that Imperialism was regarded "as the paramount issue of the campaign."

Private monopolies are denounced and the Dingley tariff law is labeled "a trust breeding measure." One paragraph is devoted to the reaffirmation of the principles of 1896 with respect to unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16-1. Sympathy is extended to the heroic Burghers in the Boer war,-----so, either the war was misnamed or the Democrats were misinformed.

But perhaps the appeal did not frighten the business man too much. There was a feeling of "reassurance"<sup>9</sup> after the Kansas City convention. "We entertain no doubt as to what the essential decision will be," stated the same paper.<sup>10</sup> "The doings of the Convention have had no effect on business one way or the other," states another financial journal.<sup>11</sup>

Though not nearly as colorful as that of 1896, the campaign of 1900 was distinguished for the number of parties that entered the lists,<sup>12</sup> though none of them equalled the Popu-

---

9 The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, July 7, 1900, 5.

10 Ibid., 6.

11 The Economist, Chicago, July 7, 1900, 7.

12 John Holladay Latane, America as a World Power. Harper Brothers, New York, 1907.

lists in their following in 1896, Not all had their own candidates, but all spoke their piece and received publicity.

The Social Democrats convened at Chicago, September 29, and suggested abolition of war and the substitution of international arbitration. The machinery of production belongs to the people, they said. No comments were made regarding Imperialism.<sup>13</sup> The People's (Fusion Faction) Party met at Sioux City. They denounced changing a "war for humanity into a war of conquest."<sup>14</sup> The Prohibition Platform regretted that the President drank wine and that we were unable to prohibit the American saloon on subjugated soil.<sup>15</sup> The Fusion Populists nominated Bryan, as did the Silver Republicans who also extended their sympathy to the South Africans.<sup>16</sup> The Socialist Labor, United Christian and Union Reform parties also made nominations.<sup>17</sup>

On the whole it can be said that the conventions and platforms roused but little interest.<sup>18</sup> The periodicals and newspapers of June and July, 1900, carried far more articles on China alone, than on the conventions. Of twenty-five leading

---

13 Kirk H. Porter, National Party Platforms. Macmillan, New York, 1924, 240.

14 Ibid., 220.

15 Ibid., 226.

16 Stuart Lewis, Party Principles and Practical Politics. Prentice Hall Inc., New York, 1928, 114, ff.

17 Ibid.

18 A. W. Dunn, From Harrison to Harding. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1922, 330.



articles for July in the American Review of Reviews, seven articles dealt with the Far East, and but two with the campaign. For the month of August there were seven articles on China, one on the Philippines and none on the campaign. The September issue had six articles on China and not until October did articles of a political nature equal the space devoted to China.<sup>19</sup> The first three pages of the Literary Digest for July 7, 1900, the week of the Democratic Convention, were devoted to affairs in China. Harper's New Monthly Magazine for June 1900, had one article on the Boers and none on the political scene. The very influential North American Review for July, 1900, published three articles on China, two on South Africa and the Boers and one on the campaign.

While our Democratic Convention did not disturb the financiers, the problems of China did. The money market in London was especially affected and Chinese bonds became unsalable. The financiers and industrialists would have liked to have known "whether all heathendom is to be marshalled against all Christendom in a war...."<sup>20</sup>

In preparation for the future it was thus expedient to send missionaries<sup>21</sup> to the Filipinos who were the "usual worthless Malay type."<sup>22</sup>

---

19 American Monthly Review of Reviews, July-October, 1900.

20 The Economist, July 2, 1900, 69.

21 A. W. Dunn, op. cit., 280

22 Henry Adams, Letters of Henry Adams. Edit. by W. P. Ford, Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1938, 215.

CHAPTER XI  
BRYAN AND ROOSEVELT SPEAK,  
AUGUST, 1900

Bryan had succeeded in forcing the old silver issue into the platform of the Democratic party, against the wishes of the party. This caused many Anti-imperialists to fall away from Bryan or at best to choose him as the lesser of two evils. A month after the convention, Bryan spoke at Indianapolis, Indiana, accepting the nomination. After making many general comments on plutocracy versus democracy and the dangers of placing the value of the dollar before the value of man, Mr. Bryan goes on to speak of the Philippine question. He omits saying anything about the question of 16-1. He "scorned to discuss the dollar."<sup>2</sup> Apparently he had merely insisted on inserting it in the platform to save face and had begun to realize that the election could never be won on this issue which no longer was vital to a people who had accepted the gold standard and were prosperous.

The bulk of the acceptance speech carries out the idea

---

1 F. L. Paxson, Recent History of U.S. Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1928, 305.

2 W. H. White, "The Election of 1900", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. XVII, Philadelphia, 1901, 53.

of the paramountcy of the issue of imperialism.<sup>3</sup> The fact that the Democrats supported the President in a war of liberation is stressed. The Republicans are accused among other things, of subverting the issue of the day in their platform in stressing economic matters.

He mentions his part in the acceptance of the treaty. It was accepted by himself, he states, in order that war might be ended, the volunteers released and the Filipinos given independence. If the treaty had been rejected, he stated, the opponents of Imperialism would have been held responsible for international complications which might have arisen. We note here that he does not present any definite plan for giving the Filipinos their independence. He rather continues at great length, speaking of the evils of Imperialism, the sentiments of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Henry Clay, and Abraham Lincoln. He accuses the Republicans of seeking to confuse Imperialism and Expansionism. He justifies our expansion into Texas by stating that the Constitution followed the flag.

Bryan reiterates a point made in the platform. Filipinos cannot be made citizens without endangering our civilization; Filipinos cannot be made subjects without endangering our form of government. The analogy Mr. Bryan offers in recalling the

---

3 For references to the acceptance speech, see Appendix 3.

position of the colonies in 1776 presupposes that the Filipinos would be able to govern themselves. According to Bryan, Admiral Dewey reported the Filipinos to be capable of self government-----more capable than the Cubans. Bryan then quotes Clay as stating that "Self-government is the natural government of man." Yes, we can govern colonies, we can disregard the tradition upon which our nation rests, but then we cannot escape being tyrants.

Four principal contentions of the imperialist are next answered. To the proposition that we should improve our opportunity to become a world power, Mr. Bryan states that we have been a world power "for more than a century". Our Declaration of Independence set a standard for the world and has been copied by many other nations-----thus making us leaders in the realm of not only political thought but human liberty. The point, namely that our commercial interests would be advanced, is answered by quoting Franklin to the effect that there is no justice in spilling blood to obtain trade and that it is further unwise to have trade which must be held in place by armies and fleets. It is not necessary to own people in order to trade with them, he says, while further pointing out that the expense is borne by all the people and the profits enjoyed by a few. The third is the religious argument. "Imperialism finds no warrant in the Bible," says Bryan, and "The command,

'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature', has no Gatling gun attachment." Our missionaries are seekers of souls and not sovereignty.

The last argument hinges about the proposition that it would be dishonorable to retreat from the Islands at this point. Just because our flag floats over Manila and Havanna is no reason why it should do so forever. It would be better, Bryan says, that our flag in the Orient should give way to a flag representing the idea of "self-government, than that the flag of this Republic should become the flag of an empire." "If elected, I will convene Congress in extraordinary session as soon as inaugurated and recommend an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose, first, to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine Islands, just as we are now establishing in Cuba; second, to give independence to the Filipinos as we have promised to give independence to the Cubans;<sup>4</sup> third, to protect the Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America."<sup>5</sup> Would the

---

4 The fact that the Democratic platform would also leave it up to the United States government to determine when independence should be granted, is brought out in an article in The Nation, New York, LXXI, July 12, 1900.

5 "...the modifications introduced in the Monroe Doctrine for the comparatively small local question of the Philippines will have to be enlarged or extended so far as to embrace the vast, complicated and pregnant problem of China." North American Review, August, 1900, 172.

electorate be able to appreciate here a clear cut distinction between the Republican and Democratic plans? Do not both aim to establish the ideals of self-government in the new acquisitions?<sup>6</sup>

The theory of manifest destiny is also opposed by Bryan. This, he says, is the "subterfuge of the invertebrate", and quoting Washington to the effect that the destiny of the republican form of government was in our hands, states that this destiny is in the hands of the American people. Our destiny must rest on "the foundation stones quarried by revolutionary patriots from the mountain of eternal truth."

Bryan concludes his speech by referring again to the propositions enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, especially that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed. "Behold a republic gradually but surely becoming the supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes."<sup>7</sup>

There can be no doubt of the moral force of Bryan's arguments. All who believed in the inalienable rights given to us by the Creator and in the principle that the governments derive

---

6 See Republican platform, Appendix 2.

7 "But there are other men who put peace ahead of righteousness, and who care so little for facts that they treat fantastic declarations for immediate universal arbitration as being valuable, instead of detrimental, to the cause they profess to champion, and who seek to make the United States impotent for international good under the pretense of making us impotent for international evil."  
Roosevelt, op. cit., 254.

their powers from the governed and that further militarism and empire-building go hand in hand were undoubtedly swayed once more by the oratory of William Jennings Bryan. Imperialism had been declared to be, according to the Democratic Platform, the paramount issue. Bryan did all in his power in this speech to make it so. Many felt that the destiny of the American people hung in the balance. If we had always been idealistic, as the quotations from the various leaders of our nation, as given by Bryan, would indicate, then certainly, now the time had arrived when we were at the crossroads. Either we were to continue to be a moral force for righteousness in the world, or we too, would become like other nations, land-grabbing empires-----no better than the other boys in the neighborhood.

The Indianapolis speech was "accepted with enthusiasm",<sup>8</sup> and seemed to clearly make of Imperialism the paramount issue of the campaign. It seemed as though Bryan had been politically wise in urging the acceptance of the Paris Treaty for he really had something to talk about now. The Democrats were again able to furnish Bryan with an opportunity to stump the country and "to speak to the people---his favorite occupation"<sup>9</sup> Of course the Republicans had more money and better organiza-

---

<sup>8</sup> W. H. White, op. cit., 65.

<sup>9</sup> A. W. Dunn, op. cit., 345.

tion. At the opening of the campaign the Republicans controlled 33% more dailies and weeklies in the ten doubtful states than did the Democrats.<sup>10</sup> The able manager Hanna had again collected a quarter million dollars from the Standard Oil Company,<sup>11</sup> a gift identical to that made in 1896, and approved by John D. Rockefeller.

McKinley did little in the way of speaking. The oratorical opposition to Bryan came mainly from Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt easily attracted as much attention as Bryan,—after all, people had been listening to Bryan for many years. Roosevelt added some color and interest to the campaign which would have erstwhile been placid and dull.<sup>12</sup> In Nebraska, Bryan's state, Roosevelt made 13 speeches a day.<sup>13</sup> Teddy represented nationalism in the most complete and popular sense. He ridiculed the Anti-imperialists. "We are a nation of men and not a nation of weaklings".<sup>14</sup> His clenched fist and display of teeth appealed to the red-blooded Americans. Even the fact that he had been a weak and sickly child and was now robust, seemed to strike a sympathetic cord in the electorate. He represented life, strength, progress and plenty of fight. He represented the energy of the new-born century.

---

10 W. H. White, op. cit., 70.

11 Allan Nevins, John D. Rockefeller. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1940, 512.

12 A. W. Dunn, op. cit., 345.

13 Oberholtzer, op. cit., 643.

14 Ibid., 644.



Roosevelt stressed Expansion rather than Imperialism. As he explained it, Expansion was to be identified with true patriotism. "....no one did more than he to bring before the American people the idea of a supreme duty of loyalty to the living, growing, vital nation that was at once an organic actuality and that seemed to possess a manly authentic personality."<sup>15</sup> The main emphasis in the last decade of the century, "in the teaching of history was a narrow type of patriotism."<sup>16</sup> The swashbuckling Roosevelt, often wearing his sombrero, made a more concrete appeal to the people than the proponents of the more negative slogan of no-imperialism. There was "something spiritual and abstract" about Bryan's plea, when compared to the Republican slogan of the full dinner pail.<sup>17</sup> Roosevelt defended the policies of the administration.<sup>18</sup> On all problems other than that of Expansion he spoke conservatively and criticized his opponents' attacks on the business interests.<sup>19</sup>

There were other capable speakers for the Republican ideology, and one of the best was their campaign manager Mark Hanna, with his easy and ingratiating platform manners, who also did much to destroy the fears instilled by Bryan.<sup>20</sup> The

---

15 M. Curti, op. cit., 199.

16 Ibid., 215.

17 I. Stone, op. cit., 76.

18 Rhodes, op. cit., 141.

19 Matthew Josephson, The President Makers. Harcourt Brace and Co., New York, 1940, 112.

20 Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 360.

workingman was won over when he spoke to them and was no longer in their eyes a "bloated plutocrat." The new Secretary of War, Elihu Root, explained that the country flourished because the government did not interfere with business and labor.<sup>21</sup>

More and more, the Republicans began to stress the condition of prosperity. The supremacy of "Expansion" seemed to have been brief. Prosperity was to be made the issue by the Republicans. "The Republican party was able, because of its superior organization and resources, to suggest its own subject for debate."<sup>22</sup> The condition of prosperity was of course important. "As long as our exports keep steadily favorable, the Republicans may commit all the crimes of the penal code with impunity...."<sup>23</sup> As long as prosperity reigned, the "calamity prophet" would have a hard fight.<sup>24</sup>

---

21 M. Josephson, op. cit., 112.

22 W. H. White, op. cit., 65.

23 H. Adams, Letters of, op. cit., 219.

24 Chicago Tribune, October 6, 1900.

## CHAPTER XII

### McKINLEY'S ACCEPTANCE, SEPTEMBER, 1900

A month after Bryan had spoken, McKinley's letter of acceptance was published. This letter, two-thirds of which was devoted to the Philippines question, seems to reply to Bryan.<sup>1</sup> He devotes more space to refuting the doctrine of 16-1 than Mr. Bryan did in speaking for it. The electorate is appealed to, merely to reaffirm their opinion of four years ago. Figures are given to show that our total money supply, as well as our per capita supply was increased. Figures are given to prove an advancing foreign trade. Receipts for customs and internal revenue are shown to have increased while expenditures have decreased. Prosperity has been proved.

With respect to the question of Imperialism, the war is reviewed and the peace negotiations outlined. The war has brought us new duties and responsibilities. We cannot shirk the moral obligations of our victory. We cannot turn the Philippines over to another power. "We must either hold them or turn them back to Spain." Quoting himself as of the 5th of May, 1899, to Jacob Gould Schurman, stationed in Manila, McKinley said: "The President earnestly desires the cessation

---

<sup>1</sup> Rhodes, op. cit., 138.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix 4 for references to McKinley's Letter Of Acceptance.

of bloodshed and that the people of the Philippine Islands, at an early date, shall have the largest measure of self-government consistent with peace and good order."

In spite of these overtures to peace, the commissioners informed the President: "We were attacked by a bold, adventurous and enthusiastic army." Thus we had to stay "until the insurgents are reduced to submission." The commissioners further informed the President that if we withdrew, the Philippines would lapse into anarchy. "Thus the welfare of the Filipinos coincides with the dictates of national honor in forbidding our abandonment of the archipelago."

McKinley states that he believed that the insurrection practically ended in March, 1900. William H. Taft was appointed to head a new commission. This commission reported that many Filipinos wanted peace and that the Filipino peoples were not now fit for self-government.<sup>3</sup>

McKinley further denies that there was any alliance between our soldiers and the insurgents. "Long before their leader had reached Manila they had resolved, if the commander of the American Navy would give them arms with which to fight the Spanish Army, they would later turn upon us, which they

---

3 General Lawton reported on July 8 from Manila in a private letter to Col. David Day of Durango, Colorado, that the Filipinos will be "before many years have passed" better Americans than some born in the United States. Congressional Record, Vol. 33, part. 8, (56th Congress), p.6674.

did murderously...." So apparently McKinley admits that we furnished the insurrectionists with arms.

In concluding, McKinley states that Imperialism has no place in the creed or conduct of the party of the Administration. That party, he states, "was builded and now rests" upon the rock of freedom. The North and South have been strengthened by the common sacrifices in the Spanish war. "The nation faces the new century gratefully and hopefully, with increasing love of country, with firm faith in its free institutions and with high resolve that they 'shall not perish from the earth.'"

Very Respectfully Yours,

William McKinley."

If the importance of Imperialism as an issue is to be measured by the relative space devoted to it by both Bryan and McKinley in their acceptance speeches, then Imperialism was certainly the paramount issue. McKinley's letter was obviously a reply to Bryan's speech of acceptance. The fact that McKinley devoted as much space to Imperialism as he did was perhaps more of a tribute to Bryan's oratory which needed a reply, than it was an indicator of public interest.

William H. White, in his article "The Election of 1900", quoted above, tells us that Expansion was not long an issue. After a most thorough study of the literature of the period,<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> W. H. White, op. cit., 65.

he tells us that "Expansion or Imperialism degenerated from a paramount issue, involving the future of our political ideals to subsidiary theme in a chorus of captious criticism upon the party in power." A full and free discussion of the desirability of an Asiatic colonial policy "was averted, perhaps for all time, perhaps only temporarily, by the operations of the machine of party organization which in the interests of the party took from the American people the opportunity to decide its future attitude toward colonization in general, and toward the Philippine Islands in particular."<sup>5</sup>

The view that prosperity and the full dinner pail were more important to the average voter than Imperialism is held by most historians of the period. Prosperity, and not foreign policy, was of greater concern.<sup>6</sup> The argument of the full dinner pail increased its hold upon the voter as the campaign advanced.<sup>7</sup> "Prosperity and the efficient management of Hanna brought the expected victory."<sup>8</sup> The electorate was more interested in wages, the price of wheat and hogs, than in the Declaration of Independence or the condition of the Filipinos.<sup>9</sup>

According to the survey of newspaper opinion by the

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Foster Rhea Dulles, Twentieth Century America, 44.

<sup>7</sup> F. L. Paxson, Recent History of U. S., 305.

<sup>8</sup> H. V. Faulkner, American Political and Social History, F.S. Crofts, New York, 1939, 550.

<sup>9</sup> Claude G. Bowers, Beveridge and the Progressive Era. Houghton Mifflin, Cambridge, Mass., 1932, 135.

Literary Digest,<sup>10</sup> there seemed to be but little agreement in the country as to the "paramountcy" of any issue. Was it silver or was it Imperialism. "Not only do Democratic and Republican papers disagree on the question....but the Democrats of the East and South disagree with the Democrats of the West, and the Republicans of the West disagree with the Republicans of the East."<sup>11</sup> Perhaps McKinley's speech had the effect of denying both silver and Imperialism as issues. He advocated that we vote to continue the prosperity which had been brought about by a wise Republican business-like administration.

---

<sup>10</sup> Literary Digest, August 11, 1900.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

## CHAPTER XIII

### PRE-ELECTION SUMMARY

There were many parties in the field and many issues debated. To some extent we should be able to determine the strength of the issues by the ferocity of the arguments brought out just before the election, after both candidates had felt their way in the vortex of public opinion. Those latter arguments would be freshest in the minds of the voters. Issues originally stressed but later dropped by the candidates themselves should be regarded as less important than those retained and re-emphasized.

Silver seemed to be such an issue. It had long been discredited, but in view of the fact that Bryan insisted on its inclusion in the Democratic Platform, against the wishes of the party bosses, it must be considered. The condition of prosperity, the increase in the supply of gold, the improved condition of the Treasury and the passage of the Gold Standard Act, all served to relegate 16-1 to the background. "A ridiculous proposal," it was called.<sup>1</sup> The Boston Post, an independent Democratic paper, said that the silver issue had become "purely academic",<sup>2</sup> and Bryan in a speech less than two

---

1 Commercial and Financial Chronicle, July 14, 1900, 54.

2 Literary Digest, July 21, 1900, 63,



weeks after the convention at Kansas did not refer to silver.<sup>3</sup> Chairman Jones of the Democratic National Committee said at that time that Imperialism and Trusts are the issues.<sup>4</sup> In August, Bryan in his acceptance speech did not refer to silver. He had apparently realized its weakness.

But the Republicans refused to let the Democrats forget that they had included it in their platform. In September, McKinley referred to Bryan's stand on the Money question as heretical and said that 16-1 menace "still hangs over us." The Republicans said that silver was the issue which the Democrats were hiding in the belly of their platform as the soldier hid in the Trojan horse.<sup>5</sup> Bryan had only "the dish of horrors of 16-1" to serve us, said Judge W. H. Peckham in the New York Evening Post.<sup>6</sup> It was said that Bryan refused to answer as to whether he would pay the nation's debts in gold or silver,<sup>7</sup> and lest the voter forget, he was reminded on the fourth of November that the money question was the paramount issue.<sup>8</sup> Though silver had been discredited, the Democratic platform spoke for it, and the Republicans were not going to let the opportunity pass. They continued to speak against 16-1 though the Democratic candidate avoided it.

---

3 Ibid., 65.

4 Ibid.

5 Chicago Daily Tribune, October 6, 1900.

6 Literary Digest, October 20, 1900, 456.

7 Chicago Daily Tribune, October 25, 1900.

8 Ibid., November 4, 1900.

There were many anti-Imperialists who could, however, not bring themselves to vote for Bryan because of his "un-sound" money position. Oswald Garrison Villard and his Eve-ning Post were in favor of gold, and, though anti-Imperialist, sat on the fence in the campaign.<sup>9</sup> Cleveland wrote to Judson Harmon, "as between imperialism and a continued struggle against sound money, you and many other good and patriotic Democrats see more danger in the first. The latter, and much more trouble we would surely get with Bryan".<sup>10</sup> The voters were not interested in experiments and were satisfied with the new Gold Standard Law.<sup>11</sup>

The end of silver as an issue and Bryan's silence on the 16-1 proposition, did not remove from him the stigma of un-soundness, for the money question implied a good deal more than the silver issue. Rockefeller feared Bryan's hostility to trusts.<sup>12</sup> The support that Bryan had had in 1896 from the unemployed and the farmers in debt could not be counted on in this period of prosperity.<sup>13</sup> Bryanism had come to stand for not only 16-1, but had over a period of years come to stand for the standard of the dissatisfied. Bryan still, it was

---

9 Villard, op. cit., 141.

10 Allan Nevins, Grover Cleveland. Dodd Mead and Co., New York, 1938, 747.

11 Noyes, op. cit., 292.

12 A. Nevins, John D. Rockefeller. Dodd Mead and Co., New York, 512.

13 The Forum, Forum Publishing Co., New York, May, 1900, 314.

claimed, made attacks on employers of labor and attempted to stir up class feeling.<sup>14</sup> He expressed anti-trust sentiments.<sup>15</sup> Democratic publications at the time of the campaign referred to the President as a king whose throne was a pyramid of gold.<sup>16</sup> The New York Tribune referred to Bryan as a dangerous enemy to the social order.<sup>17</sup>

But even on an anti-trust plank Bryan would not present a clear front. In the middle of October Bryan appeared in New York City. He was the guest of Croker the Tammany Leader, and many Tammany men had been found to be implicated in the Ice Trust. When Bryan came out with the statement: "Great is Tammany! and its prophet is Croker," he made both the reformers and the anti-imperialists unhappy.<sup>18</sup> The connections of Croker with questionable political practices and this fact was even appreciated by the English. The London Times, just prior to the election spoke of Mr. Croker, mentioning that he had been indicted for murder, and that he was proposing to throw election inspectors into the streets of New York City. "Gutter journalism has now taken up Mr. Croker's call to violence....this appeal, addressed to the Democratic Clubs and Societies of the United States, is signed by Mr. Hearst, who

---

14 Chicago Tribune, Oct. 7, 1900.

15 Ibid., Oct. 26, 1900.

16 William McKinley and the G.O.P. Under the X-Ray, (cit.) 241.

17 Literary Digest, Oct. 27, 1900, 483.

18 Ibid.

owns this sheet [Journal] as 'President of the National Association of Democratic Clubs'. To that depth have the Democratic Clubs descended."<sup>19</sup> Bryan is blamed in that he in no way disavows the plans of Mr. Croker to the use of violence if necessary to "manage" the election. The same paper goes on to say that betting odds on McKinley were five to one and offered in thousands of dollars. The issue, they said, was "Bryanism" which stood for free silver, disturbance of industry and the surrender of the Philippines.<sup>20</sup>

Mr. Bryan's connection with Mr. Hearst also made the anti-imperialists unhappy. Mr. Bryan had suggested that Mr. Hearst start a paper in Chicago. The result was the Herald for which Mr. Hearst was made President of the National Democratic Clubs. But many voters had not forgotten that Mr. Hearst helped to stimulate the war fever and so was hardly a good bed fellow for the representative of anti-imperialism.

Militarism or imperialism could not be issues, said the Chicago Tribune, for anyone could see that we could never become militaristic. To prove the point a summary of De Tocqueville's book on Democracy in America was given.<sup>21</sup> "The cry of

---

<sup>19</sup> Times, London, November 1,2,3,4,5, 1900.

<sup>20</sup> Many American periodicals also finally came to the decision that "Bryanism" and not any other "Ism" was the "paramount issue". Bryanism seemed to include the silver issue, anti-trust feeling, and anti-imperialism.

<sup>21</sup> Chicago Tribune, October 14, 1900.

imperialism is simply a pretext of the Democratic leaders to save themselves", said an article in the North American Review.<sup>22</sup> This same magazine printed an article by a Rev. F. W. Farrar who stated that imperialism meant that we were "bound to uphold, even at the cost of war, and in spite of all hazards the Empire over those vast regions which the Providence of God has placed under our dominion...." Two weeks before the election it was suggested that anti-imperialism or anti-expansionism might well wait until after the election so that we could "address ourselves to the defeat of the Republican party, without at the same time presenting principles and candidates more objectionable than theirs."<sup>23</sup> We were not to have a "Scuttle" policy, said McKinley.<sup>24</sup>

If we did not take the Philippines, other nations would. We had good reason to believe this for the Germans had manifested an interest in the islands. Their ships were in the harbor of Manila with Dewey's. A fleet of five German vessels under Vice-Admiral Diederich appeared on June 17.<sup>25</sup>

If our becoming imperialistic or not really depended on the election, i. e., if Imperialism was really the issue, one might have expected the East to be greatly interested, even

---

22 North American Review, September 1900, 298.

23 Literary Digest, October 20, 1900, XXI, 456.

24 Sullivan, op. cit., 514.

25 S. F. Bemis, A Diplomatic History of the United States. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1936, 466.

though we were not too excited ourselves. The Japan Weekly Mail, however, for the summer and fall of 1900 makes but few references to our campaign and election. Rather than fearing our imperialism the paper goes further to say that we were hardly reconciled to our new position of importance in the Far East.<sup>26</sup> We were but novices, they inferred.

Taft referred to the Filipinos as our "little brown brothers," but most Americans probably agreed with the soldier who said: "He may be a brother of Big Bill Taft, but he ain't no brother of mine."<sup>27</sup> People listened to Bryan when he said, "Wars of conquest have their origin in covetousness and the history of the human race has been written in characters of blood, because rulers have looked with longing eyes upon the lands of others".<sup>28</sup> They listened respectfully and cheered him. Then they marched to the polls to vote---for McKinley.<sup>29</sup>

---

26 Japan Daily Mail, Yokahama, July-December, 1900, XXXIV, 491.

27 Sullivan, op. cit., 7.

28 W. J. Bryan, Speeches of William Jennings Bryan, edited by himself. Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1913, II, 6.

29 Bowers, op. cit., 135.

## CHAPTER XIV

### ELECTION RESULTS

The population of the United States in 1900 was 75,994,575 and of this total 18 per cent cast a vote. Many members of both parties plainly refrained from voting.<sup>1</sup>

The popular vote for McKinley was 7,220,000 against 6,359,000 for Bryan. The President's electoral vote totaled 292 as compared with Bryan's 155. A Republican congress was again elected. Out side of the solid South, Bryan carried Colorado, Idaho, Montana and Nevada.<sup>2</sup> Nebraska, Bryan's own state, as well as Kansas, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming came over to the Republicans. Kentucky was the only state previously held which was now lost to the Administration. Bryan was not only defeated in his own state, but in his own city and precinct as well.<sup>3</sup> Some called the election a landslide,<sup>4</sup> though McKinley received but fifty-two per cent of the total popular vote, as compared to fifty-one per cent in 1896. Eugene Debs the Socialist candidate received 94,800 votes and Barker the Populist received 50,600.

In spite of the fact that but a small percentage of the

---

1 Latane, op. cit., 132.

2 Hacker and Kendrick, op. cit., 356.

3 Sullivan, op. cit., 529.

4 Walter Millis, op. cit., 409.

population had cast a ballot, the election was generally conceded to have been a mandate from the people,<sup>5</sup> endorsing the Republican Administration. The free silver "heresy" was buried again, as was populism. The suggestion that Republicanism was linked with big business didn't seem to disturb that fifty-two per cent of the electorate. The majority of the electorate were willing to march ahead into the drama of world politics, arm in arm with prosperity, rather than turn about and repudiate the steps we had so successfully taken with the Republican administration.

---

5 Lester Burrell Shippee, Recent American History. Macmillan Co., New York, 1930, 263, and also

S. E. Morrison, The Oxford History of the United States. II, Oxford University Press, 424, which refers to it as "a clear mandate."



## CHAPTER XV

### CONCLUSION

One hundred years before the election of 1900, we had less than one-fourth of the territory we then occupied. Our population was in 1800 less than one-fourteenth of what it was in 1900. Our whole history had been a story of expansion. With the frontier in the continental limits of the United States at an end in 1890, we almost automatically looked about for new fields. At the turn of the century we had achieved economic maturity and become creditors instead of debtors.

The entire "civilized" world was in an imperialistic mood. Britain was subduing South Africa; Belgium, France and Germany were active in Africa. European powers were gaining concessions in China. The British lion was inviting the American eagle to join her in the Far East.

We finally went into a "war for humanity" and acquired as a consequence, for \$20,000,000, the Philippine Islands. Our position in the Islands, in addition to holding the Hawaiian Islands, would be more consistent with the new attitude we had taken. We had "established" an "open door" policy and announced to the rest of the world that we were interested in the Far East. Our success in the Spanish-American war served to draw

the attention of the rest of the world to us and retention of the Philippines became necessary to put teeth in our new commitments in the Far East.

In view of our past, it is thus not too difficult to see why we participated in the imperialistic spirit of the period. These forces leading to expansion were very strong. Our business men believed expansion was necessary and they were seconded by politicians eager for their support. The discussions of "Imperialism" seem to fall somewhat into the background as being academic, when compared to actual forces at work pulling us into the vortex of world affairs. We plunged into "an inevitable war to conquer the Philippines....We must protect Manila and the foreign interests....," said one of the keenest of American critics.<sup>1</sup>

The war was short and successful and stimulated our national pride. Our Open Door policy was a pattern for the world. Our interests in the world had grown. Should we now deny our own success and achievements? Should we repudiate our successful administration by turning the Islands over to anarchy and let come who would take them? The Filipinos had begun an insurrection against us. Should we cowardly run away? Of course not. We had to stay and see it through.

The discussions, then, of "Imperialism" seemed somewhat

---

1 Letters of Henry Adams, op. cit., 208.

academic. We would, if necessary, rationalize about our new position, but we would not turn our backs on our achievements which were so very much in keeping with the spirit of the family of nations. However, in view of the fact that we had always professed to a principle of "isolation" it would be necessary to reconcile our new situation with the old ideology. And so we talked of Imperialism. The mere fact that the election lacked color and excitement would of itself indicate that our consideration of Imperialism was only a discussion and not a debate to determine policy. After all the war had been fought two years before the election; the Peace treaty had been ratified over a year and a half; the Philippine insurrection was equally old; the Open Door policy was several months old. Our government had already embarked upon the waters of Imperialism and the port of Conquest was in sight. Should we now turn back? Of course not. We discussed the wisdom of taking the journey which was well nigh completed. At most, the discussion would result in recommendations pro or con similar journeys in the future.

"Imperialism is the paramount issue," asserted the Democratic platform. If Imperialism was unquestionably the paramount issue, it perhaps would not have been necessary for the Democrats to call it that. Perhaps the insistence of the Democratic platform and the statements of Mr. William Jennings

Bryan could make us just slightly suspicious that other issues might exist or arise to contend for supremacy. The space devoted to Imperialism, as indicated above, in the speech of William McKinley was perhaps a necessary reply so that the party in power could not be accused of failing to meet Bryan's challenge. Once having answered him, and allayed the fears of those whose minds were not yet made up, the party in power could then proceed through the media of its greater organization and wealth to create, or to point out, other issues to the electorate.

With respect to the discussion of Imperialism, there was much confusion. In the first place the leader, William Jennings Bryan, failed to present himself to the electorate as the uncompromising candidate of anti-imperialism. He had been in favor of the war, had accepted a commission in it, had been the man responsible for the ratification of the Treaty of Paris and had now spoken of establishing sound government in the Philippines before granting them independence.

In addition to this, the electorate was faced with the problem of determining whether Bryan represented anti-imperialism, free silver, or just simply what came to be called Bryanism. A study of the press by the Literary Digest was entitled "Imperialism or Silver", and showed that there was not much agreement as to which was the issue.

The confusion thus aided the Republicans establish "Prosperity" as the issue of the campaign. Of course the fact that we had prosperity also helped them. W. H. White contends that it was superior machine politics that caused the switch from Imperialism as an issue to Prosperity.<sup>2</sup> This view, however, fails to take into account the existence of prosperity and confusion among the Democrats, factors more fundamental than Republican machinery. Imperialism as an issue had been robbed of its vitality by the condition of prosperity if not by the fact of our international successes. Admiral Dewey was, and perhaps still is,<sup>3</sup> more heroic to the young nation asserting its sovereignty among the family of nations, than the biblical Mr. Bryan.

---

<sup>2</sup> W. H. White, op. cit., 67

<sup>3</sup> Time, October 28, 1946. "Admiral Dewey was doing alright [sic]. A Manhattan picture-framing firm, totaling up its year's orders, discovered that, after General MacArthur and Eisenhower, the Admiral was still the most famed warrior."

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Source Materials

Congressional Record, 56th Congress, Vol. 33, Washington, 1900.

Messages and Papers of the Presidents, edit. Richardson, Vol. X.

Literary Digest, January to December, 1900, Vol. 21, New York, 1900.

Imperialism, a forced and fictitious issue, remarks reprinted from the speech of Hon. John C. Spooner, (Wisc), United States Senate, May 22-24, 1900.

Boutwell, George S. The Crisis of the Republic. Dana Estes and Co., Boston, 1900.

The Economist, weekly financial, commercial and real estate newspaper, Chicago, July 7, 1900 (Vol. XXIV, No. 1)

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, Vol. 71, July to December, 1900.

The North American Review, New York, July to December, 1900, Vol. CLXXI.

The American Monthly Review of Reviews, edit. by Albert Shaw, New York, July to December, 1900, Vol. XXII.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, July-November, 1900. (Chicago Public Library)

The Times, London, July-December, 1900. (Newberry Library)

The Japan Weekly Mail, Yokahama, July-December, 1900. (Newberry Library)

The Nation, a Weekly Journal, New York, July-December, 1900, Vol. LXXI.

Report of the Philippine Commission to the President,  
Vol. 1, January 31, 1900, Govt. Printing Office, Wash.

Shibley, George H. Momentous Issues, (bureau of economic research of New York City), The Schulte Publishing Co., Chicago, September, 1900.

Atlantic Monthly, New York, July-December, 1900,  
Vol. LXXXVI.

Review of Reviews, edit. by W.T. Stead, London, July-December, 1900, Vol. XXII.

Harper's New Monthly Magazine, Harper and Bros., New York, June-November, 1900, Vol. CI.

Democratic Campaign Book, Congressional Election of 1898, Issued by Authority of Democratic Congressional Committee, Washington, Thomas W. Cadick, Printer, 1898.

William McKinley and the G.O.P. under the X-Ray, Moreley and Briggs, Cleveland, Ohio, 1900.

The Forum, The Forum Publishing Co., New York, March-August, 1900, Vol. XXIX.

Time, October 28, 1946.

### General Works

Adams, Henry. The Education of Henry Adams. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1918.

Letters of Henry Adams (1892-1918), edit. by W.C. Ford. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1938.

Agar, Herbert. "The People's Choice", From Washington to Harding, A study in Democracy. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1933.

Bailey, Thomas A. A Diplomatic History of the American People. F.S. Crofts and Co., New York, 1945.

Beard, Charles A. and Mary R. The Rise of American Civilization. Vol. II, Macmillan Co., New York, 1927.

Beard, Charles A. Contemporary American History, 1877-1913. Macmillan Co., New York, 1923.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. A Diplomatic History of the United States. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1936.

Bowers, Claude G. Beveridge and the Progressive Era. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1932.

Bryan, W.J. Speeches of William Jennings Bryan. Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1913, Vol. II.

Clyde, Paul Hibbert. A History of the Modern and Contemporary Far East. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1937.

Curti, Merle, The Roots of American Loyalty. Columbia University Press, New York, 1946.

Dennis, A. L. "John Hay", in The American Secretaries of State, edit. by S. F. Bemis, New York, 1929.

Dulles, Foster Rhea, Twentieth Century America. Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1945.

Dunn, Arthur Wall. From Harrison to Harding. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1922.

Elson, Henry W. Side Lights on American History. Vol. II, Macmillan Co., New York, 1928.

Faulkner, Harold U. American Political and Social History F. S. Crofts and Co., New York, 1939.

Faulkner, Harold U. The Quest for Social Justice. Macmillan Co., New York, 1931.

Hacker, Louis M. and Kendrick, Benjamin B. The United States Since 1865. F. S. Crofts and Co., New York, 1939.

Hanna, Mark. His Book. The Chapple Publishing Co. Ltd., Boston, 1904.

Haworth, Paul L. The United States in Our Own Times 1865-1924. Charles Scribner and Sons, New York, 1924.



- Hobson, J. A. Imperialism, A Study. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1938.
- Josephson, Matthew. The President Makers. Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1940.
- Kohlsaat, H. H. From McKinley to Harding. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1923.
- Latane, John Halladay, America as a World Power, 1897-1907 (The American Nation, A History, A. B. Hart), Harper and Bros., New York, 1907.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. A Short History of the Far East. Macmillan Co., New York, 1946.
- Lewis, Stuart. Party Principles and Practical Politics. Prentice Hall, Inc., New York, 1928.
- Mason, Gregory. Remember The Maine. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1939.
- McCall, Samuel W. The Life of Thomas Brackett Reed. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1914.
- Millis, Walter. The Martial Spirit. The Literary Guild of America, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
- Mitchell, Wesley Clair, Business Cycles. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1913.
- Morrison, S. E. The Oxford History of the United States, 1783-1917. Vol. II, Oxford University Press, 1917.
- Muzzey, David S., and Krout, John A. American History for Colleges. Ginn and Co., Chicago, 1946.
- Nevins, Allan. Grover Cleveland. Dodd Mead and Co., New York, 1938.
- Nevins, Allan. John D. Rockefeller. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1946.
- Noyes, Alexander Dana. Forty Years of American Finance. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1909.

Oberholtzer, Ellis Paxson. A History of the United States Since the Civil War, (Vol. V 1888-1901). Macmillan Co., New York, 1937.

Paxson, Frederic L. History of the American Frontier. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1924.

Paxson, Frederic L. Recent History of the United States, 1865-1929. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1929.

Porter, Kirk H. National Party Platforms. Macmillan Co., New York, 1924.

Rhodes, James Ford. The McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations. Macmillan Co., New York, 1922.

Roosevelt, Theodore. An Autobiography. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1929.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., The Rise of the City. Macmillan Co., New York, 1933.

Shippee, L. R. Recent American History. Macmillan Co., New York, 1930.

Stone, Irving. They Also Ran. Doubleday, Doran and Co., New York, 1943.

Sullivan, Mark. Our Times, The United States, 1900-1925. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937.

Tarbell, Ida M. The Nationalization of Business 1878-1898. Macmillan Co., New York, 1936.

Villard, Oswald Garrison. Fighting Years. Harcourt Brace and Co., New York, 1939.

Werner, M. R. Bryan. Harcourt Brace and Co., New York, 1929.

Autobiography of William Allen White. Macmillan Co., New York, 1946.

White, William H. "The Election Of 1900", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. XVII, Philadelphia, 1901,

Wish, Harvey. Contemporary America. Harper Brothers, New York, 1945.

Woodward, W. E. A New American History. Garden City, New York, 1938.

The International Year Book. Dodd Mead and Co., New York, 1901.

World Almanac, for 1899, 1900, 1901 and 1946, New York.

Sixteenth U. S. Census. U. S. Printing Office, Washington 1942, Vol. I.

Featherstone, H. L. A Century of Nationalism. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., London, 1939.

## Appendix 1

### Democratic Platform of 1900<sup>1</sup>

We, the representatives of the Democratic party of the United States assembled in National Convention, on the Anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, do reaffirm our faith in that immortal proclamation of the inalienable rights of man, and our allegiance to the Constitution framed in harmony therewith by the fathers of the Republic. We hold with the United States Supreme Court that the Declaration of Independence is the spirit of our government, of which the Constitution is the form and letter.

We declare again that all governments instituted among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that any government not based upon the consent of the governed is a tyranny; and that to impose upon any people a government of force is to substitute the methods of imperialism for those of a republic. We hold that the Constitution follows the flag, and denounce the doctrine that an Executive or Congress deriving their existence and their powers from the Constitution can exercise lawful authority beyond it or in violation of it. We assert that no nation can long endure half republic and half empire, and we warn the American people that imperialism abroad will lead quickly and inevitably to despotism at home.

Believing in these fundamental principles, we denounce the Porto Rican Law, enacted by a Republican Congress against the protest and opposition of the Democratic minority, as a bold and open violation of the nation's organic law and a flagrant breach of the national good faith. It imposes upon the people of Porto Rico a government without their consent and taxation without representation. It dishonors the American people by repudiating a solemn pledge made in their behalf by the Commanding General of our Army, which the Porto Ricans welcomed to a peaceful and unresisted occupation of their land. It dooms to poverty and distress a people whose helplessness appeals with peculiar force to our justice and magnanimity. In this, the first act of its imperialistic programme, the Republican party seeks to commit the United States to a colonial policy, inconsistent with republican institutions and condemned by the

---

<sup>1</sup> Kirk H. Porter, National Party Platforms, Macmillan Co., New York, 1924, 210.

Supreme Court in numerous decisions.

We demand the prompt and honest fulfillment of our pledge to the Cuban people and the world that the United States has no disposition nor intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over the Island of Cuba, except for its pacification. The war ended nearly two years ago, profound peace reigns over all the island, and still the administration keeps the government of the island from its people, while Republican carpet-bag officials plunder its revenues and exploit the colonial theory, to the disgrace of the American people.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the Republic in an unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization; they cannot be subjects without imperiling our form of government; and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization now to convert the Republic into an empire, we favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give the Filipinos first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay; but even this sordid and unworthy plea fails when brought to the test of facts. The war of 'criminal aggression' against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come. Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty, the price is always too high.

We are not opposed to territorial expansion when it takes in desirable territory which can be erected into States in the Union, and whose people are willing and fit to become American citizens. We favor trade expansion by every peaceful and legitimate means. But we are unalterably opposed to seizing or purchasing distant islands to be governed outside the Constitution, and whose people can never become citizens.

We are in favor of extending the Republic's influence among the nations, but we believe that that influence should be

extended not by force and violence, but through the persuasive power of a high and honorable example.

The importance of other questions, now pending before the American people is no wise diminished and the Democratic party takes no backward step from its position on them, but the burning issue of imperialism growing out of the Spanish war involves the very existence of the Republic and the destruction of our free institutions. We regard it as the paramount issue of the campaign.

The declaration in the Republican platform adopted at the Philadelphia Convention, held in June, 1900, that the Republican party 'steadfastly adheres to the policy announced in the Monroe Doctrine' is manifestly insincere and deceptive. This profession is contradicted by the avowed policy of that party in opposition to the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine to acquire and hold sovereignty over large areas of territory and large numbers of people in the Eastern Hemisphere. We insist on the strict maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine in all its integrity, both in letter and in spirit, as necessary to prevent the extension of European authority on this Continent and as essential to our supremacy in American affairs. At the same time we declare that no American people shall ever be held by force in unwilling subjection to European authority.

We oppose militarism. It means conquest abroad and intimidation and oppression at home. It means the strong arm which has ever been fatal to free institutions. It is what millions of our citizens have fled from in Europe. It will impose upon our peace loving people a large standing army and unnecessary burden of taxation, and will be a constant menace to their liberties. A small standing army and a well-disciplined state militia are amply sufficient in time of peace. This republic has no place for a vast military establishment, a sure forerunner of compulsory military service and conscription. When the nation is in danger the volunteer soldier is his country's best defender. The National Guard of the United States should ever be cherished in the patriotic hearts of a free people. Such organizations are ever an element of strength and safety. For the first time in our history, and coeval with the Philippines conquest, has there been a wholesale departure from our time honored and approved system of volunteer organization. We Denounce it as Un-American, Un-Democratic, and Un-Republican, and as a subversion of the ancient and fixed principles of a free people.

Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material, and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer.

They lessen the employment of labor, and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof; and deprive individual energy and small capital of their opportunity of betterment.

They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and unless their insatiate greed is checked, all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the Republic destroyed. The dishonest paltering with the trust evil by the Republican party in State and National platforms is conclusive proof of the truth of the charge that trusts are the legitimate product of Republican policies, that they are fostered by the Republican laws, and that they are protected by the Republican administration, in return for campaign subscriptions and political support.

We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in nation, state and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced and more stringent ones must be enacted providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in Inter-state commerce requiring all corporations to show, before doing business outside the state of their origin, that they have no water in their stock, and that they have not attempted, and are not attempting, to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any articles of merchandise; and the whole constitutional power of Congress over Inter-state commerce, the mails and all modes of Inter-state communication, shall be exercised by enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts. Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list, to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection. The failure of the present Republican administration, with an absolute control over all the branches of the national government, to enact any legislation designed to prevent or even curtail the absorbing power of trusts and illegal combinations, or to enforce the anti-trust laws already on the statute books proves that insincerity of the high-sounding phrases of the Republican platform.

Corporations should be protected in all their rights and their legitimate interests should be respected, but any attempt by corporations to interfere with the public affairs of the people or to control the sovereignty which creates them, should be forbidden under such penalties as will make such attempts impossible

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust breeding measure, skillfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve, and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.

We favor such an enlargement of the scope of the Interstate commerce law as will enable the commission to protect individuals and communities from discrimination, and the public from unjust and unfair transportation rates.

We reaffirm and indorse the principles of the National Democratic Platform adopted at Chicago in 1896, and we reiterate the demand of that platform for an American financial system made by the American people for themselves, and which shall restore and maintain a bi-metallic price-level, and as part of such system the immediate restoration of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation.

We denounce the currency bill enacted at the last session of Congress as a step forward in the Republican policy which aims to discredit the sovereign right of the National Government to issue all money, whether coin or paper, and to bestow upon national banks the power to issue and control the volume of paper money for their own benefit. A permanent national bank currency, secured by government bonds, must have a permanent debt to rest upon, and, if the bank currency is to increase with population and business, the debt must also increase. The Republican currency scheme is, therefore, a scheme for fastening upon the taxpayers a perpetual and growing debt for the benefit of the banks. We are opposed to this private corporation paper circulated as money, but without legal tender qualities, and demand the retirement of national bank notes as fast as government paper or silver certificates can be substituted for them.

We favor an amendment to the Federal Constitution, providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and we favor direct legislation wherever practicable.

We are opposed to government by injunction; we denounce the blacklist, and favor arbitration as a means of settling disputes between corporations and their employees.

In the interest of American labor and the uplifting of the workingman, as the cornerstone of the prosperity of our country we recommend that Congress create a Department of Labor, in charge of a secretary, with a seat in the Cabinet, believing that the elevation of the American laborer will bring with it increased production and increased prosperity to our country at home and to our commerce abroad.

We are proud of the courage and fidelity of the American



soldiers and sailors in all our wars; we favor liberal pensions to them and their dependents, and we reiterate the position taken in the Chicago platform of 1896, that the fact of enlistment and service shall be deemed conclusive evidence against disease and disability before enlistment.

We favor the immediate construction, ownership and control of the Nicaraguan Canal by the United States, and we denounce the insincerity of the plank in the Republican National Platform for an Isthmian Canal in face of the failure of the Republican majority to pass the bill pending in Congress.

We condemn the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as a surrender of American rights and interests not to be tolerated by the American people.

We denounce the failure of the Republican party to carry out its pledges to grant statehood to the territories of Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma, and we promise the people of those territories immediate statehood and home rule during their condition as territories, and we favor home rule and a territorial form of government for Alaska and Porto Rico.

We favor an intelligent system of improving the arid lands of the West, storing the waters for the purpose of irrigation, and the holding of such lands for actual settlers.

We favor the continuance and strict enforcement of the Chinese exclusion law, and its application to the same classes of all Asiatic races.

Jefferson said: "Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliance with none." We approve this wholesome doctrine, and earnestly protest against the Republican departure which has involved us in so-called world politics, including the diplomacy of Europe and the intrigue and land-grabbing of Asia, and we especially condemn the ill-concealed Republican alliance with England, which must mean discrimination against other friendly nations, and which has already stifled the nation's voice while liberty is being strangled in Africa.

Believing in the principles of self-government and rejecting, as did our forefathers, the claim of monarchy, we view with indignation the purpose of England to overwhelm with force the South African Republics. Speaking, as we believe, for the entire American nation, except its Republican office-holders and for all freemen everywhere, we extend our sympathies to the heroic burghers in their unequal struggle to

maintain their liberty and independence.

We denounce the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses which have kept taxes high and which threaten the perpetuation of the oppressive war levies. We oppose the accumulation of a surplus to be squandered in such barefaced frauds upon the taxpayers as the shipping subsidy bill, which, under the false pretense of prospering American shipbuilding, would put unearned millions into the pockets of favorite contributors to the Republican campaign fund. We favor the reduction and speedy repeal of the war taxes, and a return to the time-honored Democratic policy of strict economy in governmental expenditures.

Believing that our most cherished institutions are in great peril, that the very existence of our constitutional republic is at stake, and that the decision now to be rendered will determine whether or not our children are to enjoy these blessed privileges of free government, which have made the United States great, prosperous and honored, we earnestly have presented and ask for the foregoing declaration of principles, the hearty support of the liberty-loving American people, regardless of previous party affiliations.

Kansas City, Mo. July 4, 1900

## Appendix 2

### Republican Platform of 1900<sup>2</sup>

The Republicans of the United States, through their chosen representatives, met in National Convention, looking back upon an unsurpassed record of achievement and looking forward into a great field of duty and opportunity and appealing to the judgment of their countrymen, make these declarations:

The expectation in which the American people, turning from the Democratic party, intrusted power four years ago to a Republican Chief Magistrate and a Republican Congress, has been met and satisfied. When the people then assembled at the polls, after a term of Democratic legislation and administration, business was dead, industry paralyzed and the National credit disastrously impaired. The country's capital was hidden away and its labor distressed and unemployed. The Democrats had no other plan with which to improve the ruinous conditions which they had themselves produced than to coin silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. The Republican party, denouncing this plan as sure to produce conditions even worse than those from which relief was sought, promised to restore prosperity by means of two legislative measures—a protective tariff and a law making gold the standard of value. The people by great majorities issued to the Republican party a commission to enact these laws. This commission has been executed, and the Republican promise is redeemed. Prosperity more general and more abundant than we have ever known has followed these enactments. There is no longer controversy as to the value of any Government obligations. Every American dollar is a gold dollar or its assured equivalent, and American credit stands higher than that of any other nation. Capital is fully employed and labor everywhere is profitably occupied. No single fact can more strikingly tell the story of what Republican Government means to the country than this—that while during the whole period of one hundred and seven years from 1790 to 1897 there was an excess of exports of only \$383,028,497, there has been in the three short years of the present Republican administration an excess of exports over imports in the enormous sum of \$1,483,537,094.

And while the American people, sustained by this Republican

---

<sup>2</sup> Porter, op. cit., 228.

legislation, have been achieving these splendid triumphs in their business and commerce, they have conducted and in victory concluded a war for liberty and human rights. No thought of National aggrandizement tarnished the high purpose with which American standards were unfurled. It was a war unsought and patiently resisted, but when it came the American Government was ready. Its fleets were cleared for action. Its armies were in the field, and the quick and signal triumph of its forces on land and sea bore equal tribute to the courage of American soldiers and sailors, and to the skill and foresight of Republican statesmanship. To ten millions of the human race there was given 'a new birth of freedom' and to the American people a new and noble responsibility.

We indorse the administration of William McKinley. Its acts have been established in wisdom and in patriotism, and at home and abroad it has distinctly elevated and extended the influence of the American nation. Walking untried paths and facing unforeseen responsibilities, President McKinley has been in every situation the true American patriot and the upright statesman, clear in vision, strong in judgment, firm in action, always inspiring and deserving the confidence of his countrymen.

In asking the American people to indorse this Republican record and to renew their commission to the Republican party, we remind them of the fact that the menace to their prosperity has always resided in Democratic principles, and no less in the general incapacity of the Democratic party to conduct public affairs. The prime essential of business prosperity is public confidence in the good sense of the Government and in its ability to deal intelligently with each new problem of administration and legislation. That confidence the Democratic party has never earned. It is hopelessly inadequate, and the country's prosperity, when Democratic success at the polls is announced, halts and ceases in mere anticipation of Democratic blunders and failures.

We renew our allegiance to the principle of the gold standard and declare our confidence in the wisdom of the legislation of the Fifty-sixth Congress, by which the parity of all our money and the stability of our currency upon a gold basis has been secured. We recognize that interest rates are a potent factor in production and business activity, and for the purpose of further equalizing and of further lowering the rates of interest, we favor such monetary legislation as will enable the varying needs of the season and of all sections to be promptly met in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed and commerce enlarged. The volume of money in circulation was never so great per capita as it is today. We declare our steadfast opposition to the free and unlimited coinage

of silver. No measure to that end could be considered which was without the support of the leading commercial countries of the world. However firmly Republican legislation may seem to have secured the country against the peril of base and discredited currency, the election of a Democratic President could not fail to impair the country's credit and to bring once more into question the intention of the American people to maintain upon the gold standard the parity of their money circulation. The Democratic party must be convinced that the American people will never tolerate the Chicago platform.

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest co-operation of capital to meet new business conditions and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade, but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices; and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition and secure the rights of producers, laborers, and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

We renew our faith in the policy of Protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified and maintained. By protecting the home market competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity to the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at high rates higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country. Enjoying the blessings of the American common school, secure in the right of self-government and protected in the occupancy of their own markets, their constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them to finally enter the markets of the world. We favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not produce in return for free foreign markets.

In the further interest of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands, the extension of opportunities of education for working children, the raising of the age limit for child labor, the protection of free labor as against contract convict labor, and an effective system of labor insurance.

Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would

seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The National defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

The Nation owes a debt of profound gratitude to the soldiers and sailors who have fought its battles, and it is the Government's duty to provide for the survivors and for the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in the country's wars. The pension laws, founded in this just sentiment, should be liberally administered, and preference should be given wherever practicable with respect to employment in the public service, to soldiers and sailors and to their widows and orphans.

We commend the policy of the Republican party in maintaining the efficiency of the civil service. The Administration has acted wisely in its efforts to secure for public service in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands, only those whose fitness has been determined by training and experience. We believe that employment in the public service in these territories should be confined as far as practicable to their inhabitants.

It was the plain purpose of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, to prevent discrimination on account of race or color in regulating the elective franchise. Devices of State governments, whether by statutory or constitutional enactment, to avoid the purpose of this amendment are revolutionary, and should be condemned.

Public movements looking to a permanent improvement of the roads and the highways of the country meet with our cordial approval, and we recommend this subject to the earnest consideration of the people and of the legislatures of the several states.

We favor the extension of the Rural Free Delivery service wherever its extension may be justified.

In further pursuance of the constant policy of the Republican party to provide free homes on the public domain, we recommend adequate national legislation to reclaim the arid lands of the United States, reserving control of the distribution of water for irrigation to the respective States and territories.

We favor home rule for, and the early admission to statehood of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

The Dingley Act, amended to provide sufficient revenue for the conduct of the war, has so well performed its work that it has been possible to reduce the war debt in the sum of forty million dollars. So ample are the Government's revenue and so great is the public confidence in the integrity of its obligations that its newly-funded two per cent bonds sell at a premium. The country is now justified in expecting, and it will be the policy of the Republican party to bring about, a reduction of the war taxes.

We favor the construction, ownership, control and protection of an Isthmian Canal by the Government of the United States. New markets are necessary for the increasing surplus of our farm products. Every effort should be made to open and obtain new markets, especially in the Orient, and the administration is warmly to be commended for its successful efforts to commit all trading and colonizing nations to the policy of the open door in China.

In the interest of our expanding commerce we recommend that Congress create a Department of Commerce and Industries, in the charge of a Secretary with a seat in the Cabinet. The United States Consular system should be reorganized under the supervision of this new Department upon such a basis of appointment and tenure as will render it still more serviceable to the Nation's increasing trade.

The American Government must protect the person and property of every citizen wherever they are wrongfully violated or placed in peril.

We congratulate the women of America upon their splendid record of public service in the volunteer aid association and as nurses in camp and hospital during the recent campaigns of our armies in the East and West Indies, and we appreciate their faithful co-operation in all works of education and industry.

President McKinley has conducted the foreign affairs of the United States with distinguished credit to the American people. In releasing us from the vexatious conditions of a European alliance for the government of Samoa, his course is especially to be commended. By securing to our undivided control the most important island of the Samoan group and the best harbor in the Southern Pacific, every American interest has been safeguarded.

We approve the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

We commend the part taken by our government in the Peace conference at the Hague. We assert our steadfast adherence to

the policy announced in the Monroe Doctrine. The provisions of The Hague Convention were wisely regarded when President McKinley tendered his friendly offices in the interest of peace between Great Britain and the South African Republic. While the American Government must continue the policy prescribed by Washington, affirmed by every succeeding President and imposed upon us by the Hague treaty, of non-intervention in European controversies, the American people earnestly hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to terminate the strife between them.

In accepting by the Treaty of Paris the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish war, the President and the Senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the West Indies and in the Philippine Islands. That course created our responsibility before the world, and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain, to provide for the maintenance of law and order, and for the establishment of good government and for the performance of international obligations. Our authority could not be less than our responsibility; and wherever sovereign rights were extended it became the high duty of the Government to maintain its authority, to put down armed insurrection and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued people.

The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

To Cuba independence and self-government were assured in the same voice by which war was declared, and to the latter this pledge shall be performed.

The Republican party, upon its history, and upon this declaration of its principles and policies confidently invokes the considerate and approving judgment of the American people.

Philadelphia, Pa., June 19, 1900



### Appendix 3

Acceptance Speech of William Jennings Bryan, called

"Imperialism"

and delivered in Indianapolis, Ind., August 8, 1900<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Notification Committee: I shall, at an early day, and in a more formal manner, accept the nomination which you tender, and shall at that time discuss the various questions covered by the Democratic platform. It may not be out of place, however, to submit a few observations at this time upon the general character of the contest before us and upon the question which is declared to be of paramount importance in this campaign.

When I say that the contest of 1900 is a contest between Democracy on the one hand and plutocracy on the other I do not mean to say that all our opponents have deliberately chosen to give to organized wealth a predominating influence in the affairs of the Government, but I do assert that on the important issues of the day the Republican party is dominated by those influences which constantly tend to substitute the worship of mammon for the protection of the rights of man.

In 1859 Lincoln said that the Republican party believed in the man and the dollar, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar. This is the proper relation which should exist between the two. Man, the handiwork of God, comes first; money, the handiwork of man, is of inferior importance. Man is the master, money the servant, but upon all important questions today Republican legislation tends to make money the master and man the servant.

The maxim of Jefferson, 'Equal rights to all and special privileges to none,' and the doctrine of Lincoln, that this should be a government 'of the people, by the people and for the people,' are being disregarded and the instrumentalities of government are being used to advance the interests of those who are

---

3 Speeches of William Jennings Bryan, Revised and Arranged by Himself, Vol II, Funk and Wagnalls Co., New York, 1913, 17 ff.

in a position to secure favors from the Government.

The Democratic party is not making war upon the honest acquisition of wealth; it has no desire to discourage industry, economy and thrift. On the contrary, it gives to every citizen the greatest possible stimulus to honest toil when it promises him protection in the enjoyment of the proceeds of his labor. Property rights are most secure when human rights are most respected. Democracy strives for a civilization in which every member of society will share according to his merits.

No one has a right to expect from society more than a fair compensation for the services which he renders to society, if he secures more it is at the expense of some one else. It is no injustice to him to prevent his doing injustice to another. To him who would, either through class legislation or in the absence of necessary legislation, trespass upon the rights of another the Democratic party says, 'Thou shalt not.'

Against us are arrayed a comparatively small but politically and financially powerful number who really profit by Republican policies; but with them are associated a large number who, because of their attachment to their party name, are giving their support to doctrines 'antagonistic to the former teachings of their own party.

Republicans who used to advocate bimetalism now try to convince themselves that the gold standard is good; Republicans who were formerly attached to the greenback are now seeking an excuse for giving national banks control of the Nation's paper money; Republicans who used to boast that the Republican party was paying off the national debt are now looking for reasons to support a perpetual and increasing debt; Republicans who formerly abhorred a trust now beguile themselves with the delusion that there are good trusts and bad trusts, while, in their minds, the line between the two is becoming more and more obscure; Republicans, who, in times past, congratulated the country upon the small expense of our standing army, are now making light of the objections which are urged against a large increase in the permanent military establishment; Republicans who gloried in our independence when the Nation was less powerful now look with favor upon a foreign alliance; Republicans who three years ago condemned 'forcible annexation' as immoral and even criminal are now sure that it is both immoral and criminal to oppose forcible annexation. That partizanship has already blinded many to present dangers is certain; how large a portion of the Republican party can be drawn over to the new policies remains to be seen.

For a time Republican leaders were inclined to deny to opponents the right to criticize the Philippine policy of the administration, but upon investigation they found that both Lincoln and Clay asserted and exercised the right to criticize a President during the progress of the Mexican wars.

Instead of meeting the issue boldly and submitting a clear and positive plan for dealing with the Philippine question, the Republican convention adopted a platform the larger part of which was devoted to boasting and self-congratulation.

In attempting to press economic questions upon the country to the exclusion of those which involve the very structure of our government, the Republican leaders give new evidence of their abandonment of the earlier ideals of the party and of their complete subserviency to pecuniary considerations.

But they shall not be permitted to evade the stupendous and far-reaching issue which they have deliberately brought into the arena by politics. When the President, supported by a practically unanimous vote of the House and Senate, entered upon a war with Spain for the purpose of aiding the struggling patriots of Cuba, the country, without regard to party, applauded.

Although the Democrats realized that the administration would necessarily gain a political advantage from the conduct of a war which in the very nature of the case must soon end in complete victory, they vied with the Republicans in the support which they gave to the President. When the war was over, and the Republican leaders began to suggest the propriety of a colonial policy opposition at once manifested itself.

When the President finally laid before the Senate a treaty which recognized the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ills that might follow rather than take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of this country.

I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty and end the war, release the volunteers, remove the excuse for war expenditures and then give the Filipinos the independence which might be forced from Spain by a new treaty.

In view of the criticism which my action aroused in some quarters, I take this occasion to restate the reasons given at

that time. I thought it safer to trust the American people to give independence to the Filipinos than to trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unfriendly nation.

Lincoln embodied an argument in the question when he asked, "Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws?" I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected. With the treaty ratified a clean-cut issue is presented between a government by consent and a government by force, and imperialists must bear the responsibility for all that happens until the question is settled.

If the treaty had been rejected the opponents of imperialism would have been held responsible for any international complications which might have arisen before the ratification of another treaty. But whatever difference of opinion may have existed as to the best method of opposing a colonial policy, there never was any difference as to the great importance of the question and there is no difference now as to the course to be pursued.

The title of Spain being extinguished we were at liberty to deal with the Filipinos according to American Principles. The Bacon resolution, introduced a month before hostilities broke out at Manila, promised independence to the Filipinos on the same terms that it was promised to the Cubans. I supported this resolution and believe that its adoption prior to the breaking out of hostilities would have prevented bloodshed, and that its adoption at any subsequent time would have ended hostilities.

If the treaty had been rejected considerable time would have necessarily elapsed before a new treaty could have been agreed upon and ratified, and during that time the question would have been agitating the public mind. If the Bacon resolution had been adopted by the Senate and carried out by the President, either at the time of the ratification of the treaty or at any time afterwards, it would have taken the question of imperialism out of politics, and left the American people free to deal with their domestic problems. But the resolution was defeated by the vote of the Republican Vice-President, and from that time to this a Republican Congress has refused to take any action whatever in the matter.

When hostilities broke out at Manila, Republican speakers and Republican editors at once sought to lay the blame upon those who had delayed the ratification of the treaty, and,

during the progress of the war, the same Republicans have accused the opponents of imperialism of giving encouragement to the Filipinos. This is a cowardly evasion of responsibility.

\* \* \* \* \*

Sympathy for the Boers does not arise from any unfriendliness towards England; the American people are not unfriendly toward the people of any nation. This sympathy is due to the fact that as stated in our platform, we believe in the principles of self-government and reject, as did our forefathers, the claims of monarchy. If this nation surrenders its belief in the universal application of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, it will lose the prestige and influence which it has enjoyed among the nations as an exponent of popular government.

Our opponents, conscious of the weakness of their cause, seek to confuse imperialism with expansion, and have even dared to claim Jefferson as a supporter of their policy. Jefferson spoke so freely and used language with such precision that no one can be ignorant of his views. On one occasion he declared: 'If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest.' And again he said: 'Conquest is not in our principles; it is inconsistent with our government.'

The forcible annexation of territory to be governed by arbitrary power differs as much from the acquisition of territory to be built up into States as a monarchy differs from a democracy. The Democratic party does not oppose expansion when expansion enlarges the area of the Republic and incorporates land which can be settled by American citizens, or adds to our population people who are willing to become citizens and are capable of discharging their duties as such.

The acquisition of the Louisiana territory, Florida, Texas and other tracts which have been secured from time to time enlarge the Republic and the Constitution followed the flag into the new territory. It is now proposed to seize upon distant territory already more densely populated than our own country and to force upon the people a government for which there is no warrant in our Constitution or our laws.

Even the argument that this earth belongs to those who desire to cultivate it and who have the physical power to acquire it cannot be invoked to justify the appropriation of the Philippine Islands by the United States. If the islands were uninhabited American citizens would not be willing to go there

and till the soil. The white race will not live so near the equator. Other nations have tried to colonize in the same latitude. The Netherlands have controlled Java for three hundred years and yet today there are less than sixty thousand people of European birth scattered among the twenty-five million natives.

After a century and a half of English domination in India, less than one-twentieth of one per cent of the people of India are of English birth, and it requires an army of seventy thousand British soldiers to take care of the tax collectors. Spain had asserted title to the Philippine Islands for three centuries and yet when our fleet entered Manila bay there were less than ten thousand Spaniards residing in the Philippines.

A colonial policy means that we shall send to the Philippine Islands a few traders, a few taskmasters and a few officeholders and an army large enough to support the authority of a small fraction of the people while they rule the natives.

If we have an imperial policy we must have a great standing army as its natural and necessary complement. The spirit which will justify the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands will justify the seizure of other islands and the domination of other people, and with wars of conquest we can expect a certain, if not rapid, growth of our military establishment.

That a large permanent increase in our regular army is intended by Republican leaders is not a matter of conjecture, but a matter of fact. In his message of December 5, 1898, the President asked for authority to increase the standing army to one hundred thousand. In 1896 the army contained about twenty five thousand. Within two years the President asked for four times that many, and a Republican House of Representatives complied with the request after the Spanish treaty had been signed, and when no country was at war with the United States.

\*\* \* \* \* \*

The Republican platform assumes that the Philippine Islands will be retained under American sovereignty, and we have a right to demand of the Republicans and their leaders a discussion of the future status of the Filipino. Is he to be a citizen or a subject? Are we to bring into the body politic eight or ten million Asiatics, so different from us in race and history that amalgamation is impossible? Are they to share with us in making the laws and shaping the destiny of this nation? No Republican of prominence has been bold enough to advocate such a proposi-

tion.

The McEnery resolution, adopted by the Senate immediately after the ratification of the treaty, expressly negatives this idea. The Democratic platform describes the situation when it says that the Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization. Who will dispute it? And what is the alternative? If the Filipino is not to be a citizen, shall we make him a subject? On that question the Democratic platform speaks with equal emphasis. It declares that the Filipino cannot be a subject without endangering our form of government. A republic can have no subjects. A subject is possible only in a government resting upon force; he is unknown in a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

The Republican platform says that "the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them (the Filipinos) by law." This is a strange doctrine for a government which owes its very existence to the men who offered their lives as a protest against government without consent and taxation without representation.

In what respect does the position of the Republican party differ from the position taken by the English government in 1776? Did not the English government promise a good government to the colonists? What king ever promised a bad government to his people? Did not the English government promise that the colonists should have the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and English duties? Did not the Spanish government promise to give to the Cubans the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and Spanish duties? The whole difference between a monarchy and republic may be summed up in one sentence. In a monarchy the king gives to the people what he believes to be a good government; in a republic the people secure for themselves what they believe to be a good government.

The Republican party accepted the European idea and has planted itself upon the ground taken by George III, and by every ruler who distrusts the capacity of the people for self-government or denies them a voice in their own affairs.

The Republican platform promises that some measure of self-government is to be given the Filipinos by law; but even this pledge is not fulfilled. Nearly sixteen months elapsed after the ratification of the treaty before the adjournment of Congress last June and yet no law was passed dealing with the Philippine situation. The will of the President has been the only law in the Philippine Islands wherever the American authority extends.

Why does the Republican party hesitate to legislate upon the Philippine question? Because a law would disclose the radical departure from history and precedent contemplated by those who control the Republican party. The storm of protest which greeted the Porto Rican bill was an indication of what may be expected when the American people are brought fact to fact with legislation upon this subject.

If the Porto Ricans, who welcomed annexation are to be denied the guarantees of our Constitution, what is to be the lot of the Filipinos, who resisted our authority? If secret influences could compel a disregard of our plain duty toward friendly people, living near our shores, what treatment will those same influences provide for unfriendly people 7,000 miles away? If, in this country where the people have a right to vote, Republican leaders dare not take the side of the people against the great monopolies which have grown up within the last few years, how can they be trusted to protect the Filipinos from the corporations which are waiting to exploit the islands?

Is the sunlight of full citizenship to be enjoyed by the people of the United States, and the twilight of semi-citizenship endured by the people of Porto Rico, while the thick darkness of perpetual vassalage covers the Philippines? The Porto Rico tariff law asserts the doctrine that the operation of the Constitution is confined to the forty-five States.

The Democratic party disputes this doctrine and denounces it as repugnant to both the letter and spirit of our organic law. There is no place in our system of government for the deposit of arbitrary and irresponsible power. That the leaders of a great party should claim for any President or Congress the right to treat millions of people as mere "possessions" and deal with them unrestrained by the Constitution or the bill of rights shows how far we have already departed from the ancient landmarks and indicates what may be expected if this nation deliberately enters upon a career of empire.

The territorial form of government is temporary and preparatory, and the chief security a citizen of a territory has is found in the fact that he enjoys the same constitutional guarantees and is subject to the same general laws as the citizen of a State. Take away this security and his rights will be violated and his interests sacrificed at the demand of those who have political influence. This is the evil of the colonial system, no matter by what nation it is applied.

What is our title to the Philippine Islands? Do we hold them by treaty or conquest? Did we buy them or did we take



them? Did we purchase the people? If not, how did we secure title to them? Were they thrown in with the land? Will the Republicans say that inanimate earth has value but that when that earth is molded by the Creator it becomes a fixture and passes with the soil? If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, it is impossible to secure title to people, either by force or by purchase.

We could extinguish Spain's title by treaty, but if we hold title we must hold it by some method consistent with our ideas of government. When we made allies of the Filipinos and armed them to fight against Spain, we disputed Spain's title. If we buy Spain's title we are not innocent purchasers.

There can be no doubt that we accepted and utilized the services of the Filipinos, and that when we did so we had full knowledge that they were fighting for their own independence, and I submit that history furnishes no example of turpitude baser than ours if we now substitute our yoke for the Spanish yoke.

Let us consider briefly the reasons which have been given in support of an imperialistic policy. Some say that it is our duty to hold the Philippine Islands. But duty is not an argument; it is a conclusion. To ascertain what our duty is, in any emergency, we must apply well-settled and generally accepted principles. It is our duty to avoid stealing, no matter whether the thing to be stolen is of great or little value. It is our duty to avoid killing a human being, no matter where the human being lives or to what race or class he belongs.

Every one recognizes the obligation imposed upon individuals to observe both the human and the moral law, but as some deny the application of those laws to nations, it may not be out of place to quote the opinions of others. Jefferson, than whom there is no higher political authority, said:

"I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively."

Franklin, whose learning, wisdom and virtue are a part of the priceless legacy bequeathed to us from the revolutionary days, express the same idea in even stronger language when he said:

"Justice is strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. A highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders in a gang as when single; and the nation that makes an unjust war is only a great gang."

\* \* \* \* \*

It is argued by some that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government and that, therefore, we owe it to the world to take control of them. Admiral Dewey, in an official report to the Navy Department declared the Filipinos more capable of self-government than the Cubans and said that he based his opinion upon a knowledge of both races. But I will not rest the case upon the relative advancement of the Filipinos. Henry Clay, in defending the right of the people of South America to self-government, said:

"It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then demanded to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the disposition of Providence himself to suppose that he has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man".

Clay was right. There are degrees of proficiency in the art of self-government, but it is a reflection upon the Creator to say that he denied to any people the capacity for self-government. Once admit that some people are capable of self-government and that others are not and that the capable people have a right to seize upon and govern the incapable, and you make force—brute force—the only foundation of government and invite the reign of a despot. I am not willing to believe that an all wise and an all loving God created the Filipinos and then left them thousands of years helpless until the islands attracted the attention of European nations.

\* \* \* \* \*

Some argue that American rule in the Philippine Islands will result in the better education of the Filipinos. Be not deceived. If we expect to maintain a colonial policy, we shall not find it to our advantage to educate the people. The educated Filipinos are now in revolt against us, and the most ignorant ones have made the least resistance to our domination. If we are to govern them without their consent and give them no voice in determining the taxes which they must pay, we dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States and mock us for our inconsistency.

The principal arguments, however, advanced by those who enter upon a defense of imperialism are:

First—that we must improve the present opportunity to become a world power and enter into international politics.

Second---That our commercial interests in the Philippine Islands and in the Orient make it necessary for us to hold the islands permanently.

Third---That the spread of the Christian religion will be facilitated by a colonial policy.

Fourth---That there is no honorable retreat from the position which the nation has taken.

The first argument is address to the nation's pride and the second to the nation's pocket-book. The third is intended for the church member and the fourth for the partizan.

It is sufficient answer to the first argument to say that for more than a century this nation has been a world power. For ten decades it has been the most potent influence in the world. Not only has it been a world power, but it has done more to shape the politics of the human race than all the other nations of the world combined. Because our Declaration of Independence was promulgated others have been promulgated. Because the patriots of 1776 fought for liberty others have fought for it. Because our Constitution was adopted other constitutions have been adopted.

The growth of the principle of self-government, planted on American soil, has been the overshadowing political fact of the nineteenth century. It has made this nation conspicuous among the nations and given it a place in history such as no other nation has ever enjoyed. Nothing has been able to check the onward march of this idea. I am not willing that this nation shall cast aside the omnipotent weapon of truth to seize again the weapons of physical warfare. I would not exchange the glory of this Republic for the glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began.

The permanent chairman of the last Republican National Convention presented the pecuniary argument in all its baldness when he said:

"We make no hypocritical pretense of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of those people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first. We see our duty to ourselves as well as to others. We believe in trade expansion. By every legitimate means within the province of government and constitution we mean to stimulate the expansion of our trade and open new markets."

This is the commercial argument. It is based upon the theory that war can be rightly waged for pecuniary advantage, and that it is profitable to purchase trade by force and

violence. Franklin denied both of these propositions. When Lord Howe asserted that the acts of Parliament which brought on the revolution were necessary to prevent American trade from passing into foreign channels, Franklin replied:

"To me it seems that neither the obtaining nor retaining of any trade, howsoever valuable, is an object for which men may justly spill each other's blood; that the true and sure means of extending and securing commerce are the goodness and cheapness of commodities, and that the profits of no trade can ever be equal to the expense of compelling it and holding it by fleets and armies. I consider this was against us, therefore, as both unjust and unwise."

I place the philosophy of Franklin against the sordid doctrine of those who would put a price upon the head of an American soldier and justify a war of conquest upon the ground that it will pay. The Democratic party is in favor of the expansion of trade. It would extend our trade by every legitimate and peaceful means; but it is not willing to make merchandise of human blood.

But a war of conquest is as unwise as it is unrighteous. A harbor and coaling station in the Philippines would answer every trade and military necessity and such a concession could have been secured at any time without difficulty.

It is not necessary to own people in order to trade with them. We carry on trade today with every part of the world, and our commerce has extended more rapidly than the commerce of any European empire. We do not own Japan or China, but we trade with their people. We have not absorbed the republics of Central and South America, but we trade with them. It has not been necessary to have any political connection with Canada or the nations of Europe in order to trade with them. Trade cannot be permanently profitable unless it is voluntary.

When trade is secured by force, the cost of securing it and retaining it must be taken out of the profits, and the profits are never large enough to cover the expense. Such a system would never be defended but for the fact that the expense is borne by all the people, while the profits are enjoyed by a few.

\* \* \* \* \*

Imperialism finds no warrant in the Bible. The command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," has no Gatling gun attachment. When Jesus visited a village of Samaria and the people refused to receive him, some

of the disciples suggested that fire should be called down from Heaven to avenge the insult; but the Master rebuked them and said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Suppose he had said: "We will thrash them until they understand who we are," how different would have been the history of Christianity! Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying, brutal doctrine of imperialism with the golden rule, and the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not the exploitation of them, was his method of reaching the human heart. A missionary told me that the Stars and Stripes once saved his life because his assailant recognized our flag as a flag that had no blood upon it.

Let it be known that our missionaries are seeking souls instead of sovereignty; let it be known that instead of being the advance guard of conquering armies, they are going forth to help uplift others, having their loins girt about with truth and their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace wearing the breastplate of righteousness and carrying the sword of the spirit; let it be known that they are citizens of a nation which respects the rights of the citizens of other nations as carefully as it protects the rights of its own citizens, and the welcome extended to our missionaries will be more cordial than the welcome extended to the missionaries of any other nation.

The argument made by some that it was unfortunate for the nation that it had anything to do with the Philippine Islands, but that the naval victory at Manila made the permanent acquisition of those islands necessary, is also unsound. We won a naval victory at Santiago, but that did not compel us to hold Cuba.

The shedding of American blood in the Philippine Islands does not make it imperative that we should retain possession forever; American blood was shed at San Juan Hill and El Caney, and yet the President has promised the Cubans independence. The fact that the American flag floats over Manila does not compel us to exercise perpetual sovereignty over the Islands; the American flag waves over Havana to-day, but the President has promised to haul it down when the flag of the Cuban Republic is ready to rise in its place. Better a thousand times that our flag in the Orient give way to a flag representing the idea of self-government than that the flag of this Republic should become the flag of an empire.

There is an easy, honest, honorable solution of the Philippine question. It is set forth in the Democratic platform and it is submitted with confidence to the American people. This plan I unreservedly indorse. If elected, I will convene Congress in extraordinary session as soon as inaugurated and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose, first to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine Islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in Cuba; second, to give independence to the Filipinos as we have promised to give independence to the Cubans; third, to protect the Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba.

A European protectorate often results in the plundering of the ward by the guardian. An American protectorate gives to the nation protected the advantage of our strength, without making it the victim of our greed. For three-quarters of a century the Monroe doctrine has been a shield to neighboring republics and yet it has imposed no pecuniary burden upon us. After the Filipinos had aided us in the war against Spain, we could not honorably turn them over to their former masters; we could not leave them to be the victims of the ambitious designs of European nations, and since we do not desire to make them a part of us or to hold them as subjects, we propose the only alternative, namely, to give them independence and guard them against molestation from without.

When our opponents are unable to defend their position by argument they fall back upon the assertion that it is destiny, and insist that we must submit to it, no matter how much it violates our moral precepts and our principles of government. This is a complacent philosophy. It obliterates the distinction between right and wrong and makes individuals and nations the helpless victims of circumstances.

Destiny is the subterfuge of the invertebrate, who, lacking the courage to oppose error, seeks some plausible excuse for supporting it. Washington said that the destiny of the republican form of government was deeply, if not finally, started on the experiment entrusted to the American people. How different Washington's definition of destiny from the Republican definition.

The Republicans say that this nation is in the hands of destiny; Washington believed that not only the destiny of our own nation but the destiny of the republican form of government throughout the world was entrusted to American hands. Immeasurable responsibility! The destiny of this republic is in the

hands of its own people, and upon the success of the experiment here rests the hope of humanity. No exterior force can disturb this republic, and no foreign influence should be permitted to change its course. What the future has in store for this nation no one has authority to declare, but each individual has his own idea of the nation's mission, and he owes it to his country as well as to himself to contribute as best he may to the fulfilment of that mission.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: I can never fully discharge the debt of gratitude which I owe to my countrymen for the honors which they have so generously bestowed upon me; but, sirs, whether it be my lot to occupy the high office for which the convention has named me, or to spend the remainder of my days in private life, it shall be my constant ambition and my controlling purpose to aid in realizing the high ideals of those whose wisdom and courage and sacrifices brought this republic into existence.

I can conceive of a national destiny surpassing the glories of the present and the past—a destiny which meets the responsibilities of to-day and measures up to the possibilities of the future. Behold a republic, resting securely upon the foundation stones quarried by revolutionary patriots from the mountain of eternal truth—a republic applying in practice and proclaiming to the world the self-evident proposition that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Behold a republic in which civil and religious liberty stimulate all to earnest endeavor and in which the law restrains every hand uplifted for a neighbor's injury—a republic in which every citizen is a sovereign, but in which no one cares or dares to wear a crown. Behold a republic standing erect while empires all around are bowed beneath the weight of their own armaments—a republic whose flag is loved while other flags are only feared. Behold a republic increasing in population, in wealth, in strength and in influence, solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of an universal brotherhood—a republic which shakes thrones and dissolves aristocracies by its silent example and gives light and inspiration to those who sit in darkness. Behold a republic gradually but surely becoming the supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes—a republic whose history, like the path of the just, 'is as the shining light that shineth more and more into the perfect day.'

## Appendix 4

### McKinley's Acceptance Letter<sup>4</sup>

Executive Mansion,  
Washington, D.C.  
Sept. 8, 1900

The Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge,  
Chairman Notification Committee—

My Dear Sir:

"The nomination of the Republican National convention of June 19, 1900, for the office of President of the United States which, as the official representative of the convention, you have conveyed to me is accepted. I have carefully examined the platform adopted and give to it my hearty approval. Upon the great issue of the last national election it is clear. It upholds the gold standard and indorses the legislation of the present Congress by which that standard has been effectively strengthened. The stability of our national currency is therefore secure as long as those who adhere to this platform are kept in control of the government.

In the first battle, that of 1896, the friends of the gold standard and of sound currency were triumphant, and the country is enjoying the fruits of that victory. Our antagonists, however, are not satisfied. They compel us to a second battle upon the same lines on which the first was fought and won. While regretting the reopening of this question, which can only disturb the present satisfactory financial condition of the government and visit uncertainty upon our great business enterprises, we accept the issue and again invite the sound money forces to join in winning another and, we hope, a permanent triumph for an honest financial system which will continue inviolable the public faith.

As in 1896, the three silver parties are united under the same leader, who immediately after the election of that year, in an address to the bimetallicists, said:

---

<sup>4</sup> Chicago Daily Tribune, September 10, 1900.



"The friends of bimetallism have not been vanquished; they have simply been overcome. They believe that the gold standard is a conspiracy of the money-changers against the welfare of the human race--and they will continue the warfare against it".

The policy thus proclaimed has been accepted and confirmed by these parties. The silver Democratic platform of 1900 continues the warfare against the so-called gold conspiracy when it expressly says "we reiterate the demand of that (the Chicago) platform of 1896 for an American financial system made by the American people for themselves, which shall restore and maintain a bimetallic price level, and as part of such system the immediate restoration of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of another nation".

So the issue is presented. It will be noted that the demand is for the immediate restoration of the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. If another issue is paramount this is immediate. It will admit of no delay and will suffer no postponement.

Turning to the other associated parties we find in the Populist National platform adopted at Sioux Falls, S. D., on May 10, 1900, the following declaration:

"We pledge anew the People's party never to cease the agitation until this financial conspiracy is blotted from the statute book, the Lincoln greenback restored, the bonds all paid, and all corporation money forever retired. We reaffirm the demand for the reopening of the mints of the United States for the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, the immediate increase in the volume of silver coins and certificates thus created to be substituted, dollar for dollar, for the bank notes issued by private corporations under special privilege granted by law of March 14, 1900, and prior national banking laws."

The platform of the Silver party adopted at Kansas City on July 6, 1900, makes the following announcement:

"We declare it to be our intention to lend our efforts to the repeal of this currency law, which not only repudiates the ancient and time honored principles of the American people before the constitution was adopted, but is violative of the principles of the constitution itself; and we shall not cease our efforts until there has been established in its place a monetary system based upon the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold into money at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1 by the independent action of the United States, under which

system all paper money shall be issued by the government, and all such money coined or issued shall be a full legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, without exception."

In all three platforms these parties announce that their efforts shall be unceasing until the gold act shall be blotted from the statute books and the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16-to-1 shall take its place.

The relative importance of the issues I do not stop to discuss, all of them are important. Whichever party is successful will be bound in conscience to carry into administration and legislation its several declarations and doctrines. One declaration will be as obligatory as another, but all are not immediate. It is not possible that these parties would treat the doctrine of 16-to-1, the immediate realization of which is demanded by their several platforms, as void and inoperative in the event that they should be clothed in power. Otherwise their profession of faith is insincere.

It is therefore the imperative business of those opposed to this financial heresy to prevent the triumph of the parties whose union is only assured by adherence to the silver issue. Will the American people, through indifference or fancied security, hazard the overthrow of the wise financial legislation of the last year and revive the danger of the silver standard with all of the inevitable evils of shattered confidence and general disaster which justly alarmed and aroused them in 1896?

The Chicago platform of 1896 is reaffirmed in its entirety by the Kansas City convention. Nothing has been omitted or recalled, so that all the perils then threatening are presented anew, with the added force of a deliberate reaffirmation. Four years ago the people refused to place the seal of their approval upon these dangerous and revolutionary policies, and this year they will not fail to record again their earnest dissent.

The Republican party remains faithful to its principle of a tariff which supplies sufficient revenues for the government and adequate protection to our enterprises and producers; and of reciprocity which opens foreign markets to the fruits of American labor, and furnishes new channels through which to market the surplus of American farms. The time-honored principles of protection and reciprocity were the first pledges of Republican victory to be written into public law.

The present Congress has given to Alaska a territorial government for which it had waited more than a quarter of a century; has established a representative government in Hawaii; has enacted bills for the most liberal treatment of the pen-

sioners and their widows; has revived the free homestead policy. In its great financial law it provided for the establishment of banks of issue, with a capital of \$25,000 for the benefit of villages and rural communities, and bringing the opportunity for profitable business in banking within the reach of moderate capital. Many are already availing themselves of this privilege.

During the last year more than \$19,000,000 of U.S. bonds have been paid from the surplus revenue of the Treasury, and in addition \$25,000,000 of 2 per cent matured, called by the government, are in process of payment. Pacific railroad bonds issued by the government in aid of the roads in the sum of nearly \$44,000,000 have been paid since December 31, 1897. The Treasury balance is in satisfactory condition, showing on September 1, \$135,419,000 in addition to the \$150,000,000 gold reserve held in the Treasury. The government's relations with the Pacific railroads have been substantially closed, \$124,421,000 being received from these roads, the greater part in cash and the remainder with ample securities for payments deferred.

Instead of diminishing, as was predicted four years ago, the volume of our currency is greater per capita than it has ever been. It was \$21.00 in 1896. It has increased to \$26.50 on July 1, 1900 and was \$26.85 September 1, 1900. Our total money on July 1, 1896 was \$1,506,434,966; on July 1, 1900, it was \$2,062,135,490, and \$2,096,683,042 on September 1, 1900.

Our industrial and agricultural conditions are more promising than they have been for many years; probably more so than they have ever been. Prosperity abounds everywhere throughout the republic. I rejoice that the Southern as well as the Northern States are enjoying a full share of these improved national conditions and that all are contributing so largely to our remarkable industrial development. The money lender receives lower rewards for his capital than if it were invested in active business. The rates of interest are lower than they have ever been in this country, while those things which are produced on the farm and in the workshop, and the labor producing them, have advanced in value.

Our foreign trade shows a satisfactory and increasing growth. The amount of our exports for the year 1900 over those of the exceptionally prosperous year of 1899 was about \$500,000 for every day of the year, and these sums have gone into the homes and enterprises of the people. There has been an increase of over \$50,000,000 in the exports of agricultural products; \$92,692,220 in manufactures and in the products of the mines of over \$10,000,000. Our trade balances cannot fail to give satisfaction to the people of the country.

\* \* \* \* \*

Five years ago we were selling government bonds bearing as high as 5 per cent interest. Now we are redeeming them with a bond at par bearing 2 per cent interest. We are selling our surplus products and lending our surplus money to Europe. One result of our selling to other nations so much more than we bought from them during the last three years is a redical improvement of our financial relations. The great amounts of capital which have been borrowed of Europe for our rapid, material development have remained a constant drain upon our resources for interest and dividends and made our money markets liable to constant disturbances by calls for payment or heavy sales of our securities whenever moneyed stringency or panic occurred abroad. We have now been paying these debts and bringing home many of our securities and establishing countervailing credits abroad by our loans and placing ourselves upon a sure foundation of financial independence.

\* \* \* \* \*

For the sake of full and intelligent understanding of the Philippine question, and to give to the people authentic information of the acts and aims of the administration, I present at some length the events of importance leading up to the present situation. The purpose of the Executive are best revealed and can best be judged by what he has done and is doing. It will be seen that the power of the government has been used for the liberty, the peace, and the prosperity of the Philippine peoples, and that force has been employed only against force which stood in the way of the realization of these ends.

On the 25th day of April, 1898, Congress declared a state of war existed between Spain and the United States. On May 1, 1898, Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay. On May 19, 1898, Major-General Merritt, U.S.A., was placed in command of the military expedition to Manila, and directed, among other things, immediately to "publish a proclamation declaring that we come not to make war upon any part or faction among them, but to protect them in their homes, in their employment, and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who, either by active aid or by honest submission, cooperate with the United States in its efforts to give effect to this beneficent purpose will receive the reward of its support and protection."

On July 3, 1898, the Spanish fleet, in attempting to escape from Santiago harbor, was destroyed by the American fleet, and on July 17, 1898, the Spanish garrison in the City of Santiago surrendered to the commander of the American forces.

Following these brilliant victories, on the 12th day of August, 1898, upon the initiative of Spain, hostilities were suspended, and a protocol was signed with a view to arranging terms of peace between the two governments. In pursuance thereof I appointed as commissioners the following distinguished citizens to conduct the negotiations on the part of the United States: the Hon. William R. Day of Ohio; the Hon. William P. Frye of Maine; the Hon. Cushing K. Davis of Minn.; the Hon. George Gray of Delaware; and the Hon. Whitelaw Reid of New York.

In addressing the Peace commission before its departure for Paris I said:

"It is my wish that throughout the negotiations intrusted to the commission the purpose and spirit with which the United States accepted the unwelcome necessity of war should be kept constantly in view. We took up arms only in obedience to the dictates of humanity, and in the fulfillment of high public and moral obligations. We had no design of aggrandizement and no ambition of conquest. Through the long course of repeated representations which preceded and aimed to avert the struggle, and in the final arbitrament of force, this country was impelled solely by the purpose of relieving grievous wrongs, and removing long-existing, which disturbed its tranquility, which shocked the moral sense of mankind, and which could no longer be endured.

"It is my earnest wish that the United States, in making peace, should follow the same high rule of conduct which guided it in facing war. It should be as scrupulous and magnanimous in the concluding settlement as it was just and humane in its original action....

"Our aims in the adjustment of peace should be directed to lasting results, and to the achievement of the common good under the demands of civilization, rather than to ambitious designs. Without any original thought of complete or even partial acquisition, the presence and success of our arms at Manila imposes upon us obligations which we cannot disregard. The march of events rules and overrules human action. Avowing unreservedly the purpose which has animated all our effort, and still solicitous to adhere to it, we cannot be unmindful that, without any desire or design on our part, the war has brought us new duties and responsibilities, which we must meet and discharge, as becomes a great nation on whose growth and career from the beginning the ruler of nations has plainly written the high command and pledge of civilization."

On October 28, 1898, while the Peace commission was continuing its negotiations in Paris, the following additional instruction was sent:

"It is imperative upon us that as victors we should be governed only by motives which will exalt our nation. Territorial expansion should be our least concern, that we shall not shirk the moral obligations of our victory is of the greatest. It is undisputed that Spain's authority is permanently destroyed in every part of the Philippines. To leave any part in her feeble control now would increase our difficulties and be opposed to the interests of humanity....Nor can we permit Spain to transfer any of the islands to another power. Nor can we invite another power or powers to join the United States in sovereignty over them. We must either hold them or turn them back to Spain.

"Consequently grave as are the responsibilities and unforeseen as are the difficulties which are before us the President can see but one plain path of duty, the acceptance of the archipelago. Greater difficulties and more serious complications—administrative and international—would follow any other course. The President has given to the views of the commissioners the fullest consideration, and in the conclusion reached above, announced in the light of information communicated to the commission and to the President since your departure, he has been influenced by the single consideration of duty and humanity. The President is not unmindful of the distressed financial condition of Spain and whatever consideration the United States may show must come from its sense of generosity and benevolence rather than from any real or technical obligation".

Again on November 13, I instructed the commission:

"From the standpoint of indemnity both the archipelagoes (Porto Rico and the Philippines) are insufficient to pay our war expenses, but aside from this we do not owe an obligation to the people of the Philippines which will not permit us to return them to the sovereignty of Spain? Could we justify ourselves in such a course, or could we permit their barter to some other power? Willing or not, we have the responsibility of duty which we cannot escape....The President cannot believe any division of the archipelago can bring us anything but embarrassment in the future. The trade and commercial side, as well as the indemnity for the cost of the war, are questions we might yield. They might be waived or compromised, but the questions of duty and humanity appeal to the President so strongly that he can find no appropriate answer but the one he has here marked out."

The treaty of peace was concluded on December 10, 1898. By its terms the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands

was ceded by Spain to the United States. It was also provided that the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress. Eleven days thereafter, on December 21, the following direction was given to the commander of our forces in the Philippines:

"...The military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the securing of the persons and property of the people of the islands, and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights."

In order to facilitate the most humane, pacific, and effective extension of authority throughout these islands, and to secure, with the least possible delay, the benefits of a wise and generous protection of life and property to the inhabitants I appointed in January, 1899, a commission consisting of the Hon. Jacob Gould Schurman of New York; Admiral George Dewey, U.S.N.; the Hon. Charles Denby of Indiana; Professor Dean C. Worcester of Michigan; and Major-General Elwell S. Otis, U.S.A. Their instructions contained the following:

"In the performance of this duty the commissioners are enjoined to meet at the earliest possible day in the City of Manila and to announce by public proclamation their presence and the mission intrusted to them, carefully setting forth that while the military government already proclaimed is to be maintained and continued so long as necessity may require, efforts will be made to alleviate the burden of taxation, to establish industrial and commercial prosperity, and to provide for the safety of persons and of property by such means as may be found conducive to these ends.

"The commissioners will endeavor, without interference with the military authorities of the United States now in control of the Philippines, to ascertain what amelioration in the condition of the inhabitants and what improvements in public order may be practicable and for this purpose they will study attentively the existing social and political state of the various populations, particularly as regards the forms of

local government, the administration of justice, the collection of customs and other taxes, the means of transportation, and the need of public improvements. They will report...the results of their observations and reflections and will recommend such executive action as may from time to time seem to them wise and useful.

"The commissioners are hereby authorized to confer authoritatively with any persons resident in the islands from whom they may believe themselves able to derive information or suggestions valuable for the purpose of their commission, or whom they may choose to employ as agents, as may be necessary for the purpose....

"It is my desire that in all their relations with the inhabitants of the islands the commissioners exercise due respect for all the ideals, customs, and institutions of the tribes which compose the population, emphasizing upon all occasions the just and beneficent intentions of the government of the United States. It is also my wish and expectation that the commissioners may be received in a manner due to the honored and authorized representatives of the American republic, duly commissioned on account of their knowledge, skill and integrity as bearers of the good will, the protection and the richest blessings of a liberating rather than a conquering nation."

On the 6th of February, 1899, the treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States, and the Congress immediately appropriated \$20,000,000 to carry out its provisions. The ratifications were exchanged by the United States and Spain on the 11th of April, 1899.

As early as April, 1899, the Philippine Commission of which Dr. Schurman was President, endeavored to bring about peace in the islands by repeated conferences with leading Tagal representing the so-called insurgent government, to the end that some general plan of government might be offered them which they would accept. So great was the satisfaction of the insurgent commissioners with the form of government proposed by the American commissioners that the latter submitted the proposed scheme to me for approval, and my action thereon is shown by the cable message following:

"May 5, 1899—Schurman, Manila: Yours 4th received. You are authorized to propose that under the military power of the President, pending action of Congress, government of the Philippine Islands shall consist of a Governor General, appointed by the President; Cabinet, appointed by the Governor



General; a general advisory council elected by the people; the qualifications of electors to be carefully considered and determined; and the Governor General to have absolute veto; judiciary strong and independent; principal Judges appointed by the President; the Cabinet and Judges to be chosen from natives or Americans, or both, having regard to fitness. The President earnestly desires the cessation of bloodshed, and that the people of the Philippine Islands at an early date shall have the largest measure of local self-government consistent with peace and good order."

In the latter part of May another group of representatives came from the insurgent leader. The whole matter was fully discussed with them and promise of acceptance seemed near at hand. They assured our commissioners they would return after consulting with their leader, but they never did.

As a result of the views expressed by the first Tagal representative favorably to the plans of the commission, it appears that he was by military order of the insurgent leader, stripped of his shoulder straps, dismissed from the army and sentenced to twelve years imprisonment.

The views of the commissioners are best set forth in their own words:

"Deplorable as war is, the one in which we are now engaged was unavoidable by us. We were attacked by a bold, adventurous and enthusiastic army. No alternative was left to us except ignominious retreat.

"It is not to be conceived of that any American would have sanctioned the surrender of Manila to the insurgents. Our obligations to other friendly Filipinos and to other nations and to ourselves and our flag, demanded that force should be met by force. Whatever the future of the Philippines may be there is no course open to us now except the prosecution of the war until the insurgents are reduced to submission.

"The commission is of the opinion that there has been no time since the destruction of the Spanish squadron by Admiral Dewey when it was possible to withdraw our forces from the islands either with honor to ourselves or with safety to the inhabitants."

After the most thorough study of the peoples of the archipelago, the commission reported among other things:

"Their lack of education and political experience, combined with their racial and linguistic diversities,

disqualify them, in spite of their mental gifts and domestic virtues, to undertake the task of governing the archipelago at the present time. The most that can be expected of them is to cooperate with the Americans in the administration of general affairs, from Manila as a center, and to undertake, subject to American control or guidance (as may be found necessary) the administration of provincial and municipal affairs.

"Should our power by any fatality be withdrawn, the commission believes that the government of the Philippines would speedily lapse into anarchy, which would excuse, if it did not necessitate the intervention of other powers and the eventual division of the islands among them. Only then American occupation, therefore, is the idea of a free, self-governing, and united Philippine commonwealth at all conceivable.

"Thus the welfare of the Filipinos coincides with the dictates of national honor in forbidding our abandonment of the archipelago. We cannot, from any point of view, escape the responsibility of government which our sovereignty entails; and the commission is strongly persuaded that the performance of our national duty will prove the greatest blessing to the people of the Philippine Islands."

Satisfied that nothing further could be accomplished in the pursuance of their mission until the rebellion was suppressed, and desiring to place before the Congress the result of their observations, I requested that the commissioners return to the United States. Their most intelligent and comprehensive report was submitted to Congress.

In March, 1900, believing that the insurrection was practically ended and earnestly desiring to promote the establishment of a stable government in the archipelago, I appointed the following commission: the Hon. William H. Taft of Ohio; Professor Dean C. Worcester of Michigan; the Hon. Luke I. Wright of Tennessee; the Hon. Henry C. Ide of Vermont; and the Hon. Bernard Moses of California. My instructions to them contained the following:

"You (the Secretary of War) will instruct the commission...to devote their attention in the first instance to the establishment of municipal governments in which the natives of the islands, both in the cities and in the rural communities shall be afforded the opportunity to manage their own local affairs, to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and subject to the least degree of supervision and control, which a careful study of their capacities and observation of the workings of native control show to be consistent with the maintenance of law, order and loyalty....Whenever the commission is

of the opinion that the condition of affairs in the islands is such that the administration may safely be transferred from military to civil control they will report that conclusion to you (the Secretary of War), with the recommendations as to the form of central government to be established for the purpose of taking over the control....

"Beginning with the first day of September, 1900, the authority to exercise, subject to my approval, then the Secretary of War, that part of the power of government in the Philippine Islands which is of a legislative nature is to be transferred from the Military Governor of the islands to this commission to be thereafter exercised by them in the place and stead of the Military Governor, under such rules and regulations as you (the Secretary of War) shall prescribe, until the establishment of the civil central government for the Island contemplated in the last foregoing paragraph, or until Congress shall otherwise provide. Exercise of this legislative authority will include the making of rules and orders having the effect of law for the raising of revenue by taxes, customs duties and imports, the appropriation and expenditure of the public funds of the Islands, the establishment of an educational system to secure an efficient civil service, the organization and establishment of courts, the organization and establishment of municipal and other matters of a civil nature for which the Military Governor is now competent to provide by rules or orders of a legislative character. The commission will also have power during the same period to appoint to office such officers under the judicial, educational and civil service systems, and in the municipal and departmental governments as shall be provided for."

\* \* \* \* \*

This commission, under date of August 21, 1900, makes an interesting report from which I quote the following extracts:

"Hostility against Americans originally aroused by absurd falsehoods of unscrupulous leaders. The distribution of troops in 300 posts has by contact largely dispelled hostility and steadily improved temper of people. This improvement is furthered by abuses of insurgents. Large numbers of people long for peace and are willing to accept government under the United States. Insurgents, not surrendering after defeat, divided into small guerilla bands under general officers or became robbers. Nearly all of the prominent Generals and politicians of the insurrection, except Aguinaldo, have since been captured or have surrendered and taken the oath of allegiance.

"...All northern Luzon, except two provinces, substantial-

ly free from insurgents. People busy planting, and asking for municipal organization. Railway and telegraph line from Manila to Dagupan, 122 miles not molested for five months....

"...For years of war and lawlessness in parts of islands have created unsettled conditions....Native constabulary and militia which should be organized at once, will end this and the terrorism to which defenseless people are subjected. The natives desire to enlist in these organizations. If judiciously selected and officered will be efficient forces for maintenance of order and will permit early material reduction of United States troops...."

"Turning islands over to coterie of Tagalog politicians will blight fair prospects of enormous improvement, drive out capital, make life and property, secular and religious most insecure; banish by fear of cruel proscription considerable body of conservative Filipinos who have aided Americans in well-founded belief that their people are not now fit for self-government and reintroduce same oppression and corruption which existed in all provinces under Maiolos insurgent government during the eight months of its control. The result will be factional strife between jealous leaders, chaos and anarchy, and will require and justify active intervention of our government or some other...."

\* \* \* \* \*

In the report of the first Philippine commission, submitted on November 2, 1899, Admiral Dewey, one of its members, said:

"No alliance of any kind was entered into with Aguinaldo nor was any promise of independence made to him at any time."

General Merritt arrived in the Philippines on July 25, 1898, and a dispatch from Admiral Dewey to the government at Washington said:

"Merritt arrived yesterday. Situation is most critical at Manila. The Spanish may surrender at any moment. Merritt's most difficult problem will be how to deal with the insurgents under Aguinaldo, who have become aggressive and even threatening toward our army." Here is revealed the spirit of the insurgents as early as July, 1898, before the protocol was signed, while we were still engaged in active war with Spain. Even then the insurgents were threatening our army

\* \* \* \* \*

There has been no time since the destruction of the enemy's fleet when we could or should have left the Philippine archipelago. After the treaty of peace was ratified, no power but Congress could surrender our sovereignty or alienate a foot of the territory thus acquired. The Congress has not seen fit to do the one or the other, and the President had no authority to do either, if he had been so inclined, which he was not. So long as the sovereignty remains in us it is the duty of the Executive, whoever he may be, to uphold that sovereignty and if it be attacked to suppress its assailants. Would our political adversaries do less?

\* \* \* \* \*

In short, the propositions of those opposed to us is to continue all the obligations in the Philippines which now rest upon the government, only changing the relation from principal, which now exists, to that of surety. Our responsibility is to remain, but our power is to be diminished. Our obligation is to be no less, but our title is to be surrendered to another power, which is without experience or training, or the ability to maintain a stable government at home and absolutely helpless to perform its international obligations with the rest of the world. To this we are opposed. We should not yield our title while our obligations last. In the language of our platform, "Our authority should not be less than our responsibility", and our present responsibility is to establish our authority in every part of the islands.

No government can so certainly preserve the peace, restore public order, establish law, justice, and stable conditions as ours. Neither Congress nor the Executive can establish a stable government in these islands except under our right of sovereignty, our authority, and our flag. And this we are doing.

\* \* \* \* \*

Those who profess to distrust the liberal and honorable purposes of the administration in its treatment of the Philippines are not justified. Imperialism has no place in its creed or conduct. Freedom is a rock upon which the Republican party was builded and now rests.

The obliteration of old differences, the common devotion to the flag, and the common sacrifices for its honor, so conspicuously shown by the men of the North and South in the Spanish war, have so strengthened the ties of friendship and mutual

respect that nothing can ever again divide us. The nation faces the new century gratefully and hopefully, with increasing love of country, with firm faith in its free institutions and with high resolve that they "shall not perish from the earth."

Very respectfully yours,

William McKinley

## Appendix 5

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY  
Howard L. Bevis, President  
COLUMBUS 10

Department of History

November 5, 1946

Mr. Henry Borzo  
5549 Winthrop Avenue, N  
Chicago 40, Illinois

Dear Mr. Borzo:

I am very much interested in your letter of October 27 in regard to your thesis on "Imperialism in the Election of 1900."

The statement that "A majority of the people favored retention of the Philippines" cannot, of course, be proved, but I think any examination of popular opinion, as well as the election returns in 1900, suggest that the public was prepared to go along with the republican program of expansion. To make an effective study of this question would demand as comprehensive a review as possible of contemporary newspapers and magazines. I can only suggest that you approach it from this angle if you wish your dissertation to make any real contribution to our understanding of the period.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Foster Rhea Dulles  
/t/ Foster Rhea Dulles

FRD:B

C O P Y

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Henry Borzo has been read and approved by three members of the Department of History.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

June 10, 1947  
Date

Paul Kivier  
Signature of Adviser